

A  
TREATISE  
OF THE  
POPE'S  
SUPREMACY

To which is added  
A DISCOURSE  
Concerning the  
Unity of the Church.

---

By *ISAAC BARROW*, D. D. Late  
Master of *Trinity* College in *Cambridge*, and one of His  
MAJESTY'S Chaplains in Ordinary.

---

Published by His Grace Dr. *JOHN TILLOTSON*, Late  
Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

---

The **Fourth Edition** Corrected.  
With a **TABLE** to the Whole.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Brabazon Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons*, against the  
Royal Exchange in *Cornhill*. 1700.



PRELATE

POPES

EMANCIPATION

A DISCOURSE

Concerning the Church.

By JAMES H. JACKSON, D. D.  
Minister of the Gospel in the Church of the Holy Trinity, New York.

Published by the Committee of the Board of Christian Missions, New York.

The Friends of the Cause of the Colored People  
With a TABLE to the Whole.

LONDON: 1845.  
Printed for the Board of Christian Missions, in the Strand, opposite the  
Royal Exchange, in Great Britain.

TO THE  
RIGHT HONOURABLE  
**HENEAGE**  
Earl of Nottingham,  
Lord High CHANCELLOR  
O F  
**ENGLAND,**

And One of  
His *MAJESTY'S* most Honourable  
PRIVY COUNCIL;

THOMAS BARROW, the *Author's* Father,

Humbly Dedicateth this

TREATISE.

oldenrod

---

---

T H E  
PUBLISHER  
TO THE  
READER.

**T**HIS excellent and elaborate Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, which I here present thee withall, the learned Author of it upon his Death-bed gave me a particular permission to publish; with this modest Character of it, That he hoped it was indifferent perfect, though not altogether as he intended it, if God had granted him longer life. He designed indeed to have transcribed it again, and to have fill'd up those many Spaces which were purposely left in it, for the farther confirmation and illustration of several things by more Testimonies and Instances, which probably he had in his thoughts: And it would certainly have added much to the beauty and perfection of this Work, had it pleased God that he had lived to finish it to his mind, and to have given it his last hand.

How.



---

### The Publisher to the Reader.

---

However, as it is, it is not only a just but an admirable Discourse upon this Subject; which many others have handled before, but he hath exhausted it: insomuch that no Argument of moment, nay hardly any Consideration properly belonging to it, hath escaped his large and comprehensive Mind. He hath said enough to silence the Controversy for ever, and to deter all wise Men, of both Sides, from meddling any farther with it.

And I dare say, that whoever shall carefully peruse this Treatise will find, that this Point of the Pope's Supremacy, (upon which Bellarmine hath the confidence to say, the whole of Christianity depends) is not only an indefensible, but an impudent Cause, as ever was undertaken by learned Pens. And nothing could have kept it so long from becoming ridiculous in the Judgment of Mankind, but its being so strongly supported by a worldly Interest. For there is not one tolerable Argument for it, and there are a thousand invincible Reasons against it. There is neither from Scripture, nor Reason, nor Antiquity, any evidence of it; The past and the present state of Christendom, the Histories and Records of all Ages, are a perpetual Demonstration against it: And there is no other ground in the whole World for it, but that now of a long time it hath been by the Pope's Janizaries boldly asserted, and stiffly contended for without reason. So that any one might with as much colour and evidence of truth maintain, that the Grand Seignior is of right, and for many Ages hath been acknowledg'd Sovereign of the whole World, as that the Bishop of Rome is of right, and in all Ages from the beginning of Christianity hath been own'd

to

---

The Publisher to the Reader.

---

to be the Universal Monarch and Head of the Christian Church.

To this Treatise of The Pope's Supremacy I have, for the affinity of the Argument, added by way of Appendix another Discourse of the same Author's concerning The Unity of the Church; which he so explains as quite to take away the necessity of a Visible Head over the whole Church for the preservation of its Unity, which is the only specious, but yet a very remote pretence for the Pope's Supremacy: For if a Visible Monarch of the Church were granted necessary, many things more must be supposed, (which neither yet are; nor ever can be proved) to make the Bishop of Rome the Man.

The Testimonies relating to both Parts, were very few of them translated by the Author; which he certainly intended, having left Spaces for it, and is since done with great Care by two of his Worthy and Learned Friends of his own College.

This is all the Advertisement I thought necessary.

J. Tillotson.

---

T H E

---

# THE CONTENTS.

THE Introduction.	Page 1.
The Suppositions upon which the Pope's Supremacy is grounded.	p. 26.
I. That Saint Peter had a Primacy over the Apostles.	p. 27.
II. That Saint Peter's Primacy, with its Rights and Prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his Successors.	p. 72.
III. That Saint Peter was Bishop of Rome.	p. 78.
IV. That Saint Peter did continue Bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.	p. 83.
V. That the Bishops of Rome (according to God's institution, and by original right derived thence) should have an Universal Supremacy and Jurisdiction over the Christian Church.	p. 90.
VI. That in fact the Roman Bishops continually from Saint Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this Sovereign Power.	p. 181.
VII. That this Power is indefectible and unalterable.	p. 252.
A Discourse of the Unity of the Church.	p. 271

IMPRIMATUR,

Ex Aedibus Lamb.  
Feb. 27. 1679.

Geo. Thop, Rmo. in Christo Patri  
& Dno Dno Gulielmo, Archiep.  
Cant. à Sacris Domesticis.

---

A

# TREATISE

OF THE

## Pope's Supremacy.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

§ I. **T**HE *Roman* Party doth much glory in Unity and Certainty of Doctrine, as things peculiar to them, and which no other Men have any means to attain: Yet about divers matters of notable consideration, in what they agree, or of what they are certain, it is hard to descry.

They pretend it very needful that Controversies should be decided, and that they have a special knack of doing it: Yet do many Controversies of great weight and consequence stick on their hands unresolved, many Points rest in great doubt and debate among them.

The *νόμιμα δόγματα* of the *Roman* Sect (concerning Doctrine, Practice, Laws and Customs of Discipline, Rites and Ceremonies) are of divers sorts, or built on divers grounds. 1. Some established by (pretended) general Synods. 2. Some founded on Decrees of Popes. 3. Some entertained as upon Tradition, Custom, common Agreement. 4. Some which their eminent Divines or Schoolmen do commonly embrace. 5. Some prevailing by the favour of the *Roman* Court, and its zealous Dependents.

Hence it is very difficult to know wherein their Religion consisteth: for those Grounds divers times seem to clash, and accordingly their Divines (some building on these, some on others) disagree.

This being so in many Points of importance, is so particularly in this.

For instance, The Head of their Church (as they call it) is, one would think, a Subject about which they should thoroughly consent, and which they by this time should have cleared from all disputes; so that (so far as their decisive faculty goeth) we might be assured wherein his Authority consisteth, and how far it doth extend; seeing the resolution of that Point so nearly toucheth the heart of Religion, the Faith and Practice of all Christians, the good of the Church, and peace of the World; seeing that no one Question (perhaps not all Questions together) hath created so many tragical Disturbances in Christendom, as that concerning the bounds of Papal Authority.

*Agitur de summa res Christiane. Bell. Praef. de Rom. Pont.*  
Upon this

one Point the very sum and substance of Christianity depends.

B

This



## A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy.

This disagreement of the *Roman* Doctors about the nature and extent of Papal Authority is a shrewd prejudice against it. If a Man should sue for a piece of Land, and his Advocates (the notablest could be had, and well payed) could not find where it lieth, how it is butted and bounded, from whom it was conveyed to him—one would be very apt to suspect his Title: If God had instituted such an Office, it is highly probable, we might satisfactorily know what the Nature and use of it were: the Patents and Charters for it would declare it.

Yet for resolution in this great Case we are left to seek; they not having either the will, or the courage, or the power to determine it. This insuperable Problem hath baffled all their infallible methods of deciding Controversies; their Traditions blundering, their Synods clashing, their Divines wrangling endlessly about what kind of thing the Pope is, and what Power he rightly may claim.

*Tanta est inter Doctores controversia de plenitudine Ecclesiastica potestatis, & ad que se extendat, ut pauca sint in ea materia secuta—Almain. de Auth. Eccl. cap. 3.*

*There is (saith a great Divine among them) so much controversy about the plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power, and to what things it may extend it self, that few things in that matter are secure —*

This is a plain argument of the impotency of the Pope's power in judging and deciding Controversies, or of his Cause in this matter; that he cannot define a Point so nearly concerning him, and which he so much desireth an Agreement in; that he cannot settle his own Claim out of doubt; that all his Authority cannot secure it self from contest.

So indeed it is, that no Spells can allay some Spirits; and where Interests are irreconcilable, Opinions will be so.

Some Points are so tough and so touchy, that no-body dare meddle with them, fearing that their resolution will fail of success, and submission. Hence even the anathematizing Definers of *Trent* (the boldest Undertakers to decide Controversies that ever were) did wave this Point;

*—di'avertire, Che non si venga mai per qual causa si sia alla disputa dell'Autorita di Papa. Concil. Trid. lib. 2. p. 159.*

the Legates of the Pope being enjoined, *to advertise, That they should not for any cause whatever come to dispute about the Pope's Authority.*

It was indeed wisely done of them to decline this Question, their Authority not being strong enough to bear the weight of a Decision in favour of the *Roman* See, against which they could do nothing,) according to its Pretences; as appeareth by one clear instance. For whereas that Council took upon it incidentally to enact, that any Prince should be excommunicate, and deprived of the dominion of any City or Place, where he should permit a Duel to be fought; the Prelates of *France* in the Convention of Orders, *Anno* 1595. did declare against that Decree, as infringing their King's Authority.

*Hic articulus est contra auctoritatem Regis, qui non potest privari suo dominio temporali, respectu cujus nullum superiorem recognoscit. Boechell. 5. tit. 20. c. 49.*

This Article is against the Authority of the King; who cannot be deprived of his Temporal Dominion, where in he acknowledges no Superior.

It was therefore advisedly done not to meddle with so ticklish a point. But in the mean time their Policy seemeth greater than their Charity; which might have inclined them not to leave the World in darkness and doubt, and unresolved in a Point of so main importance; (as indeed they did in others of no small consequence, disputed among their Divines with obstinate Heat, viz. The Divine Right of Bishops, the Necessity of Residence, the immaculate Conception, &c.)

The Opinions therefore among them concerning the Pope's Authority, as they have been, so they are, and in likelihood may continue, very different.

§. II. There

§.II. There are among them those who ascribe to the Pope an universal, absolute and boundless Empire over all Persons indifferently, and in all Matters; conferr'd and settled on him by Divine immutable sanction: so that all Men of whatever degree are obliged in conscience to believe whatever he doth authoritatively dictate, and to obey whatever he doth prescribe. So that if Princes themselves do refuse obedience to his will, he may excommunicate them, cashier them, depose them, extirpate them. If he chargeth us to hold no Communion with our Prince, to renounce our Allegiance to him, to abandon, oppose and persecute him even to death, we may without scruple, we must in duty obey. If he doth interdict whole Nations from the exercise of God's Worship and Service, they must comply therein. So that, according to their conceits, he is in effect Sovereign Lord of all the World; and superiour, even in Temporal or Civil matters, unto all Kings and Princes.

It is notorious, that many Canonists (if not most) and many Divines of that Party do maintain this Doctrine; affirming, that all the Power of Christ (the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings, to whom all Power in Heaven and Earth doth appertain) is imparted to the Pope, as to his Vice-gerent.

*Prima sententia est, summum Pontificem jure divino habere plenissimam potestatem in universum orbem terrarum, tam in rebus Ecclesiasticis quam Civilibus. Ita docent Aug. Triumphus, Alvarus Pelagius, Panormitanus, Hostiensis, Silvester, & alii non pauci. Bell. 5.1.*

The first Opinion is, that the Pope hath a most full Power over the whole World, both in Ecclesiastical and Civil affairs. This is the Doctrine of Aug. Triumphus, &c. and of many others.

This is the Doctrine which almost 400 years ago Augustinus Triumphus, in his egregious Work concerning Ecclesiastical Power, did teach; attributing to the Pope an incomprehensible and infinite Power; because great is the Lord, and great is his Power, and of his Greatness there is no end.

*Scripti e-  
gregiam  
summam  
de potesta-  
te Eccle-  
sie. Bell de  
Script. An. 1301. Error est, non credere Pontificem Rom. Universalis Ecclesie Pastorem, Petri Successorem, & Christi Vicarium, supra temporalia & spiritualia Universalem non habere Primatum; in quem quandoq; miles labun-  
tur, dicte potestatis ighorantiâ; quæ cum sit infinita, ed quod magnus est Dominus, & magna vertus ejus, & magnitudinis ejus non est finis, omnis creatus intellectus in ejus perscrutatione invenitur deficere. Aug. Triumph. de Potest. Eccl. in pref. ad P. Joh. XXI.*

This is the Doctrine which the leading Theologue of their Sect, their Angelical Doctor, doth affirm, both directly, saying, that in the Pope is the top of both Powers; and by plain consequence, asserting, that when any one is denounced excommunicate for Apostasy, his Subjects are immediately freed from his dominion, and their Oath of Allegiance to him.

*Thomas in fine Se-  
cun. Sen-  
tent. dicit  
in Papa  
esse aperi-  
entem utri-  
usq; Potestatis. Bell 5.1. Quum quis per sententiam denunciatur propter Apostasiam excommunicatus, ipso facto ejus subditi a domino, & juramento fidelitatis ejus liberati sunt. Th. 2. Secund. qu. 12. art. 2.*

This the same Thomas (or an Author passing under his name, in his Book S. Thomas touching the Rule of Princes,) doth teach, affirming, that the Pope, as Supreme King of all the World, may impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy Towns and Castles for the preservation of Christianity.

*S. Thomas (in lib. 3. de Regim. Princ. cap. 10. & 19.) affir-  
mat summum Pontificem jure divino habere spiritualem & temporalem Potestatem, ut supremum totius mundi Regem, adeo ut etiam tales omnibus Christianis possit imponere, & civitates ac castra destruere pro conservatione Christianitatis. Bell. 5.5.*

This (as Card. Zabarell near 300 years ago telleth us) is the Doctrine which, for a long time, those who would please Popes did persuade them, that they could do all things, whatever they pleased; yea and things unlawful; and so could do more than God.

*Quæ jura sunt no-  
tanda, quia mala considerata sunt  
per multos assensatores, qui voluerunt placere Pontificibus, per multa retro tempora, & usq; ad hodierna suaserunt eis, quod omnia possent; & sic quod facerent quicquid liberet, etiam illicita, & sic plus quam Deus. Zab. de Sbisim.*

According to this Doctrine then current at Rome, in the last Lateran Orbis Great Synod, under the Pope's nose and in his ear, one Bishop styled him Prince of the World; another Orator called him King of Kings, and

Regum Monarch of the Earth; another great Prelate said of him, that he had all  
 Rex, & Power above all Powers both of Heaven and Earth. And the same roused  
 Orbis ter- up Pope Leo X. in these brave terms; Snatch up therefore the two-edged  
 rarum sword of Divine Power, committed to thee; and injoin, command and charge,  
 Monarcha, that an universal Peace and Alliance be made among Christians for at least  
 Del Rio, 10 years; and to that bind Kings in the fetters of the great King, and com-  
 Sess. 8. p. 87. strain Nobles by the iron manacles of Censures: for to thee is given all Power in  
 --- Virum, Heaven and in Earth.

stas supra omnes Potestates, tam celi, quam terra. Episc. Patrac. Sess. 10. p. 132.

Arripe ergo gladium Divinae Potestatis tibi creditum, his acutum; & jube, impera, manda, ut Pax universalis &  
 Colligatio per decennium inter Christianos ad minus fiat; & Reges ad id in compedibus magni Regis liga, & Nobiles  
 in manibus ferreis Censurarum constringe: quoniam tibi data est omnis Potestas in caelo & in terra. Ibid. p. 133.

\* Politi- This is the Doctrine which Baronius with a Roman confidence doth  
 cum Prin- so often assert, and drive forward, saying, \*that there can be no doubt of it,  
 cipatum but that the Civil Principality is subject to the Sacerdotal: And, † that  
 Sacerdo- God hath made the Political Government subject to the Dominion of the Spi-  
 talis esse rital Church.  
 subjectum  
 nulla po-  
 test esse dubitatio. An. 57. §. 13. † Politicum Imperium subiecit spiritualis Ecclesiae dominio. Ib. §. 33.

§. III. From that Doctrine the Opinion in effect doth not differ, which  
 Bellarmine voucheth for the common Opinion of Catholicks, that by rea-  
 son of the Spiritual Power the Pope at least indirectly hath a Supreme Power  
 even in temporal matters.

Tertia Bellarmine voucheth for the common Opinion of Catholicks, that by rea-  
 sententia son of the Spiritual Power the Pope at least indirectly hath a Supreme Power  
 media & even in temporal matters.  
 Catholico-  
 rum communis, Pontificem ut Pontificem non habere directè & immediatè ullam temporalem potestatem, sed so-  
 lum spirituales, tamen ratione spiritualis habere saltem indirectè potestatem quandam, eamq; summam, in tem-  
 poralibus. Bell. §. 1.

This Opinion, so common, doth not, I say, in effect, and practical  
 consideration, any-wise differ from the former; but only in words de-  
 vised to shun envy, and veil the impudence of the other Assertion: for  
 the qualifications, by reason of the Spiritual Power, and, at least indirectly,  
 are but notional, insignificant and illusive in regard to practice: it im-  
 porting not, if he hath in his keeping a Sovereign Power, upon what ac-  
 count, or in what formality he doth employ it; seeing that every mat-  
 ter is easily referrible to a spiritual account; seeing he is sole Judge upon  
 what account he doth act; seeing experience sheweth, that he will spi-  
 ritualize all his interests, and upon any occasion exercise that pretended  
 Authority; seeing it little mattereth, if he may strike Princes, whether  
 he doth it by a downright blow, or slantingly.

§. IV. That such an universal and absolute Power hath been claimed  
 by divers Popes, successively for many Ages, is apparent from their  
 most solemn Declarations, and notorious Practices; whereof (begin-  
 ning from later times, and rising upward toward the source of this  
 Doctrine) we shall represent some.

An. 1585. The Bull of P. Sixtus V. against the Two Sons of wrath, Henry K. of Na-  
 varre, and the P. of Conde, beginneth thus; The

Ab immensa aeterni Regis potentia B.  
 Petro ejusq; Successoribus tradita Aucto-  
 ritas omnes terrenorum Regum & Princi-  
 pum supereminet Potestates — Inconcussa  
 profert in omnes judicia — Et si quos  
 ordinationi Dei resistentes invenit, seve-  
 riore hos vindicta ulciscitur, & quavis  
 potentiores, de solio desiciens, veluti su-  
 perbiensis Luciferi ministros, ad infima  
 terrae deturbatos prostermit.

Dominis Regnis, &c. nos illos illorumq;  
 posteris privamus in perpetuum.

Authority given to Saint Peter and his Successors by  
 the immense Power of the Eternal King excels all  
 the Powers of earthly Kings and Princes. — It passes  
 uncontrollable sentence upon them all. — And if it  
 find any of them resisting God's Ordinance, it takes  
 more severe vengeance of them, casting them down  
 from their Thrones, though never so puissant, and  
 tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth,  
 as the Ministers of aspiring Lucifer. And then he  
 proceeds to thunder against them, We deprive them and their posterity  
 for



for ever of their Dominions and Kingdoms, and accordingly he depriveth those Princes of their Kingdoms and Dominions, absolveth their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and forbiddeth them to pay any Obedience to them. By the Authority of these presents, we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such Oath, and from all duty whatsoever in regard of Dominion, Fealty and Obedience, and do charge and forbid all and every of them, that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their Admonitions, Laws and Commands.

P. Pius V. (one of the Holiest Popes of the last stamp, who hardly hath escaped Canonization until now) beginneth his Bull against our Q. Elizabeth in these words; He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all Power in Heaven and in Earth, hath committed the one H. Catholick and Apostolick Church, out of which there is no Salvation, to one alone on earth; namely to Peter Prince of the Apostles, and to the Roman Pontife, Successor of Peter, to be governed with a plenitude of Power: This one he hath constituted Prince over all Nations, and all Kingdoms, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruinate, plant and build. — And in the same Bull he declares, that he thereby deprives the Queen of her pretended Right to the Kingdom, and of all Dominion, Dignity and Privilege whatsoever; and absolves all the Nobles, Subjects and People of the Kingdom, and whoever else have sworn to her, from their Oath, and all duty whatsoever, in regard of Dominion, Fidelity and Obedience.

P. Clement VI. did pretend to depose the Emperour Lewis IV. An. 1346.

P. Clement V. in the great Synod of Vienna, declared the Emperour subject to him, or standing obliged to him by a proper Oath of Fealty. An. 1311.  
*Apostolica auctoritate de fratrum nostrorum consilio declaramus, illa juramenta predicta fidelitatis existere & censerì debere. Clem. lib. 2. tit. 9. Vide Conc. Vienn. p. 909.*

P. Boniface VIII. hath a Decree extant in the Canon-Law running thus; We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of necessity to Salvation, for every humane Creature to be subject to the Romane Pontife. The which Subjection, according to this intent, reacheth all matters; for he there challengeth a double Sword, and asserteth to himself Jurisdiction over all Temporal Authorities: for, One Sword (saith he) must be under another, and the temporal Authority must be subject to the Spiritual Power — whence if the Earthly Power doth go astray, it must be judged by the Spiritual Power. The which Aphorisms he proveth by Scriptures admirably expounded to that purpose.

This Definition might pass for a Rant of that boisterous Pope, (a Man above measure ambitious and arrogant,) vented in his passion against K. Philip of France, if it had not the advantage (of a greater than which no Papal Decree is capable) of being expressly confirmed by one of their General Councils; for, We (saith Pope Leo X. in his Bull read and passed

in

*A Juramento hujusmodi, ac omni prorsus Domini, Fidelitatis & Obsequii debito, illos omnes tam universè quàm singulatim auctoritate presentium absolvimus & liberamus; precipimusque & interdiciamus eò universis & singulis, ne illis eorumque monitis, legibus & mandatis audeant obedire.*

*Bulla Sixti V. Contra Henr. Navarr. R. &c.*

Pius V. — *Quem mirum est in albo Sanctorum nondum relatum esse. Briet. Chr. Anno 1572.*

*Regnans in excelsis, cui data est omnis in celo & in terra potestas, unam Sanctam, Catholicam & Apostolicam Ecclesiam, extra quam nulla est Salus, uni soli in terris, videlicet Apostolorum Principi Petro, Petriq; Successori Romano Pontifici, in potestatis plenitudine tradidit gubernandam: Hunc unum super omnes gentes & omnia regna Principem constituit, qui evellat, destruat, dissipet, disperdat, plantet & aedificet. — P. Pius V. in Bull. contra R. Eliz. (Cambd. Hist. Anno 1570.)*

*Ipsam prætenso regni jure, nec non omni quocumq; dominio, dignitate privilegiq; privamus; & iterum Proceres, subditos, &c. Ibid.*

*Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humane creaturae declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis. Extrav. com. lib. 1. tit. 8. cap. 1.*

*Oportet gladium esse sub gladio, & temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subiaci potestati. Ibid.*

*Ergo si deviat terrena potestas, judicabitur à potestate spirituali. Ibid.*

*Vir super modum ambitiosus & arrogans (Binius in vita Bonif. VIII.)*



*Constitutionem ipsam, sacro presenti Concilio approbasse, innovamus & approbamus. Concil. Lateran. Sess. II. p. 151.*

*Quam extravagantem renovavit & approbavit Concilium Lateranense sub Leone X. Cantus loc. 64.*

*Hæc Bonifacius, cui assentiuntur omnes, ut nullus discrepet, nisi qui dissidio ab Ecclesia excidit. Baron. Anno 1053. § 14.*

in the Lateran Council) do renew and approve that H. Constitution, with approbation of the present H. Council. Accordingly Melch. Canus saith, that the Lateran Council did renew and approve that extravagant (indeed extravagant) Constitution: and Baronius saith of it, that all do assent to it, so that none dissenteth; who doth not by discord fall from the Church.

The Truth is, P. Boniface did not invent that Proposition, but borrowed it from the School; for Thomas Aquinas, in his work against the Greeks, pretendeth to shew, that it is of necessity to Salvation to be subject to the Roman Pontife. The which Scholastical

*Offenditur etiam quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis. (Tho. in opusc. contra Græcos.)*

Aphorism P. Boniface turned into Law, and applied to his purpose of exercising domination over Princes; offering in virtue of it to deprive King Philip of his Kingdom.

The Appendix to Mart. Pol. saith of P. Boniface VIII. *Regem se Regum, Mundi Monarcham, unicum in Spiritualibus & Temporalibus Dominum promulgavit*; That he openly declar'd himself to be King of Kings, Monarch of the World, and sole Lord and Governour both in Spirituals and Temporals.

An. 1245. Before him, P. Innocent IV. did hold and exemplify the same notion; declaring the Emperour Frederick II. his Vassal, and denouncing in his General Council of Lyons a sentence of deprivation against him in these terms: We having about the foregoing and many other his wicked Miscarriages had before a careful deliberation with our Brethren and the H. Council, seeing that we, although unworthy to hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth, and that it was said unto us in the Person of Saint Peter the Apostle, Whatever thou shalt bind on earth—

*Nos itaque super præmissis, &c. P. Innoc. IV. in Conc. Ludg.*

Matt. Paris (Anno 1253.) saith, he deemed Kings Mancipia Papæ.

the said Prince (who hath rendred himself unworthy of Empire and Kingdoms, and of all Honour and Dignity, and who for his Iniquities is cast away by God, that he should not reign or command, being bound by his Sins, and cast away, and deprived by the Lord of all Honour and Dignity) do shew, denounce, and accordingly by Sentence deprive; absolving all who are held bound by Oath of Allegiance from such Oath for ever; by Apostolical Authority firmly prohibiting, that no Man henceforth do obey or regard him as Emperour or King; and decreeing, that whoever shall hereafter yield advice, or aid, or favour to him as Emperour or King, shall immediately lie under the band of Excommunication.

*Verè stupor mundi, & immutator seculi. Matt. Par. Anno 1217.*

*Ut quanta est inter Solem & Lunam tanta inter Pontifices & Reges differentia cognoscatur. P. Innoc. III. in Decret. Greg. lib. I. tit. 33. cap. 6.*

\*Jer. I. 10. *Jeremy, Ecce, constitui te super gentes & regna—* \* See, I have set thee over the Nations and over the Kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, &c.

Before him, Pope Innocent the Third, (that true wonder of the World, and changer of the Age,) did affirm the Pontifical Authority so much to exceed the Royal Power, as the Sun doth the Moon; and applieth to the former that of the Prophet

Of this Power that Pope made experiment, by deposing the Emperour Otho IV; whom, (saith Nauclerus) as rebellious to the Apostolical See, he first did strike with an Anathema; then him persevering in his obstinacy did in a Council of Prelates held at Rome pronounce deposed from Empire.

*entem anathemate primum, deinde in pertinacia perseverantem, in Concilio Prasulum, quod Roma tum Innocentius celebrabat, ab Imperio depositum percussit & pronuntiavit. Naucl. Anno 1212.*

The

The which Authority was avowed by that great Council under this Pope, (the which, according to the Men of Trent, did represent or constitute the Church,) wherein it was ordain'd, that if a Temporal Lord, being required and admonished by the Church, should neglect to purge his Territory from Heretical filth, he should by the Metropolitan and the other Comprovincial Bishops be noosed in the band of Excommunication; and that if he should slight to make satisfaction within a year, it should be signified to the Pope, that he might from that time denounce the Subjects absolved from their Fealty to him, and expose the Territory to be seized on by Catholics, &c.

Before that, Pope Paschal II. deprived Henry IV. and excited enemies to persecute him; telling them, that they could not offer a more acceptable Sacrifice to God, than by impugning him, who endeavoured to take the Kingdom from God's Church.

*abique, cum poteris, Henricum, Hereticorum caput, & ejus fautores pro viribus persequaris. Nullum pro te deus sacrificium, quamvis eum impugnes, qui se contra Deum erexit, qui Ecclesie regnum auferre conatur. P. Pasch. Ep. 7. ad Rob. Fland. Com.*

Before him, Pope Urban II. (called Turban by some in his Age) did preach this Doctrine, recommended to us in the Decrees, that Subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the Fidelity which they have sworn to a Christian Prince, who opposes God and his Saints, or violateth their Precepts. An instance whereof we have in his granting a privilege to the Canons of Tours; \* which (saith he) if any Emperour, King, Prince, &c. shall wilfully attempt to thwart, let him be deprived of the dignity of his honour and power.

But the great Apostle (if not Author) of this confounding Doctrine was Pope Gregory VII. (a Man of a bold spirit and fiery temper, inured even before his entry on that See to bear sway, and drive on daring projects, possessed with resolution to use the advantages of his place and time in pushing forward the Papal Interest to the utmost,) who did lift up his voice like a Trumpet, kindling Wars and Seditions thereby over Christendom. His Dictates and Practices are well known, being iterated in his own Epistles, and in the Roman Councils under him, extant: Yet it may be worth the while to hear him swagger in his own language.

For the dignity and defence of God's Holy Church, in the name of Almighty God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, I depose from Imperial and Royal Administration King Henry, Son of Henry sometime Emperour, who too boldly and rashly hath laid hands on thy Church; and I absolve all Christians subject to the Empire from that Oath whereby they were wont to plight their faith unto true Kings: for it is right, that he should be deprived of Dignity, who doth endeavour to diminish the Majesty of the Church.

*nomine, Patris, Filii, & Spiritus S. Henricum Regem, Henrici quondam Imperatoris filium, qui audacter nimium & temerarie in Ecclesiam suam manus iniecit, Imperatoriam administrationem Regique deiecit; & Christianos omnes Imperii subiectos Juramento illo absolveo, quo fidelem veris Regibus prestare consueverunt: dignum enim est, ut si honore careat, qui majestatem Ecclesie imminuere causatur. Plat. in Greg. VII. & Tom. 7. Conc. Rom. 3. apud Bin. p. 484.*

Go to therefore, most Holy Princes of the Apostles, and what I said, by interposing your Authority, confirm; that all Men may now at length understand if ye can bind and loose in Heaven, that ye also can upon Earth take away and give Princes.

*Neque enim per Lateranense Consilium Ecclesia statuit, &c. Syn. Trid. Sess. 14. cap. 5.*

*Si vero Dominus temporalis requisitus & monitus. Conc. Later. cap. 3. in Decret. Greg. lib. 5. tit. 7. cap. 13.*

*Anno 1099. Nam in hac non tantum parte, sed*

*Anno 1088.*

*Fidelitatem Christiano Principi jurant, Deo ejusque San-*

*\* Si quis*

*Vid. ejus dictata apud Bin. post. Ep. l. 2. Ep. 55.*

*Hac itaque fiducia fretum, pro dignitate & tutela Ecclesie sue Sancte, Omnipotentis Dei*

*Agite igitur, Apostolorum sanctissimi, give Princes.*

*Et quod dixi—* give Empires, Kingdoms, and whatsoever Mortals can have: for if ye can judge things belonging unto God, what is to be deemed concerning these inferiour and profane things? And if it is your part to judge Angels, who govern proud Princes, what becometh it you to do toward their Servants? Let Kings now and all Secular Princes learn by this Man's example, what ye can do in Heaven, and in what esteem ye are with God; and let them henceforth fear to slight the commands of Holy Church: but put forth suddenly this judgment, that all Men may understand, that not casually, but by your means this Son of iniquity doth fall from his Kingdom.

*Plat. in Greg. VII. Conc. Rom. 7. apud Bin. Tom. 7. p. 491.*

So did that Pope, not unadvisedly in heat or passion, but out of settled judgment, upon cool deliberation, expresse himself in his Synods at Rome.

*Quod ex novella Traditione Hildebrandus—*

This Pope is indeed by many held the inventor and broacher of this strange Doctrine; and even those, who about his Age did oppose it, did expresse themselves of this mind; calling it the novel Tradition, Schism, Heresie of Hildebrand.

*Eccl. Leod. apud Bin. Tom. 7. p. 521.*

*Hildebrandus P. auctor est huius novelli Schismatis, Et primus levavit sacerdotalem lanceam contra diadem regni. Ib. p. 522. Qui primus se, Et suo exemplo alios Pontifices, contra Imp. accinxit gladio belli. Ibid. p. 523.*

Pope Hildebrand (saith the Church of Leige, in their answer to the Epistle to P. Paschal.) is Author of this New Schism, and first did raise the Priests Lance against the Royal Diadem.——Who first did girt himself, and by his example other Popes, with the sword of war against the Emperors.

*Hec sola Novitas, ne dicam Heresis nondum in mundo emerferat, ut Sacerdotes illius qui dicunt Regi,*

This only Novelty, (saith Sigebert) not to say Heresie, had not yet sprang up in the World, that the Priests of him \* who saith to the King, Apostate, and who maketh Hypocrites to reign for the sins of the People, should teach the People, that they owe no subjection to bad Kings, and although they have sworn Allegiance to the King: they yet owe him none and that they who take part against the King may not be said to be perjured; yea, that he who shall obey the King may be held excommunicate; he that shall oppose the King, may be absolved from the crime of injustice and perjury.

*Apostata, Et qui regnare facit hypocritas propter peccata populi, doceant populum, quod malis Regibus nullam debeant subjectionem, Et licet ei Sacramentum fidelitatis fecerint, nullam tamen fidelitatem debeant; nec perjury dicantur, qui contra Regem senserint; imo, qui Regi paruerit pro excommunicato habeatur; qui contra Regem fecerit, a noxa injustitiae Et perjurii absolvatur. Sigeb. Chron. Anno 1088. Job 34. 18. 30.*

*Nos, sanctorum predecessorum statuta tenentes, eos*

Indeed certain it is, that this Man did in most downright strains hold the Doctrine, and most smartly apply it to practice; yet did he disclaim the invention or introduction of it; professing that he followed the notions and examples of his Predecessors; divers of which he alledgeth in defence of his proceedings. We, (saith he) holding the Statutes of our Holy Predecessors, do by Apostolical authority absolve those from their Oath who are obliged by Fealty or Sacrament to excommunicate Persons, and by all means prohibit that they observe Fealty to them.

*qui excommunicati fidelitate aut sacramento constricti sunt, Apostolica auctoritate a sacramento absolvimus, Et ne eam fidelitatem observent omnibus modis prohibemus. Greg. VII. Ep. 8. 21. Caus. 15. qu. 7. cap. 4.*

And so it is, that (although for many successions before Pope Hildebrand the Popes were not in condition or capacity to take so much upon them; there having been a row of Persons intruded into that See, void of virtue, and of small authority, most of them very Beasts, who depended upon the favour of Princes for their admittance, confirmation or support in the place; yet) we may find some Popes before him, who had a great spice of those imperious conceits, and upon occasion



casion made very bold with Princes, assuming power over them, and darting menaces against them. For,

Pope Leo IX. telleth us, that *Constantine M. did think it very unbecoming, that they should be subject to an Earthly Empire whom the Divine Majesty had set over an Heavenly*: and surely he was of his Author's mind, whom he alledged; although indeed this Pope may be supposed to speak this, and other sayings to that purpose, by suggestion of *Hildebrand*, by whom he was much governed.

*Valde indignum fore arbitratus, terreno imperio subdi, quos Divina Majestas prefecit celesti. P. Leo IX. Ep. 1. c. 12.*

Pope *Stephanus VI.* told the Emperor *Basilius*, that he ought to be subject with all veneration to the Roman Church.

*Plat. in vita Leon. IX. Qui te seduxit, ut Pontificem Oecumenicum*

*menicum scommaribus lacefferes, & S. Romanam Ecclesiam maledictis incefferes, cui cum omni veneratione subditus esse debes? Steph. VI. Ep. 1. Baron. Anno 885. §. 11.*

Pope *John VIII.* (or IX.) did pretend Obedience due to him from Princes; and in default thereof threatened to excommunicate them.

*Anno 873. — cunctis venire per*

*inobedientiam neglexistis. Joh. VIII. Ep. 119. deinceps excommunicamus omnes, &c. Ibid.*

Pope *Nicolas I.* cast many imperious sayings and threats at King *Lotharius*; these among others. *We do therefore by Apostolical authority, under obtestation of the Divine judgment, injoin to thee, that in Triers and Colen thou shouldst not suffer any Bishop to be chosen, before a report be made to our Apostleship.* (Was not this *satis pro imperio*?) And again, *That being compelled thou mayst be able to repent, know, that very soon thou shalt be struck with the Ecclesiastical Sword; so that thou mayst be afraid any more to commit such things in God's holy Church.*

*Anno 858. Idcirco Apostolicam auctoritatem, sub Divini iudicii obtestatione, injungimus tibi, ut in Treviren-*

*si urbe & in Agrippina Colonia nullum eligi patiaris, antequam relatum super hoc nostro Apostolatu fiat. Grat. Dist. 63. cap. 4.*

*Ut saltem compullus respicere valeas, noveris, te citissime mucrone Ecclesiastico feriendum; ita ut ulterius talia in S. Dei Ecclesia perpetrare formides. P. Nic. I. Ep. 64.*

And this he suggesteth for right Doctrine, that Subjection is not due to bad Princes; perverting the Apostle's words to that purpose, *Be subject to the King as excelling, that is, faith he, in vertues, not in vices*: whereas the Apostle meaneth eminency in power.

*Regi quasi præcellentis, virtutibus scilicet,*

*cet, non vitiis, subditi estote. P. Nic. I. Epist. 4. append. p. 626.*

Pope *Gegory VII.* doth also alledge Pope *Zachary*, who (faith he) did depose the King of the Franks, and did absolve all the French from the Oath of fidelity which they had taken unto him, not so much for his iniquities, as because he was unfit for such a Power.

*Alius item Rom. Pontifex, Zacharias scilicet, Regem*

*Francorum, non tam pro suis iniquitatibus, quam pro eo quod tantæ potestati erat inutilis, deposuit — omnesque Francigenas à juramento fidelitatis quod illi — Decret. 2. part. Caus. 15. q. 6.*

This indeed was a notable act of jurisdiction, if Pope *Gregory's* word may be taken for matter of fact, but divers maintain, that Pope *Zachary* did only concur with the rebellious deposers of King *Chilperick* in way of advice or approbation, not by authority

It was pretty briskly said of Pope *Ardian I.* *We do by general decree constitute, that whatever King, or Bishop, or Potentate, shall hereafter believe, or permit that the Censure of the Roman Pontifes may be violated in any case, he shall be an execrable Anathema, and shall be guilty before God as a betrayer of the Catholick Faith.*

*An. 772. Generali decreto constituimus, ut execrandum Anathema sit, & veluti prævaricator Catholice Fidei semper apud Deum reus existat, quicumque Regum, seu Episcoporum, vel Potentum, deinceps Romanorum Pontificum Censuram in quocumque crediderit, vel permiserit violandam. P. Had. I. Capit. apud Grat. Caus. 25. qu. 1. cap. 11.*

*thema sit, & veluti prævaricator Catholice Fidei semper apud Deum reus existat, quicumque Regum, seu Episcoporum, vel Potentum, deinceps Romanorum Pontificum Censuram in quocumque crediderit, vel permiserit violandam. P. Had. I. Capit. apud Grat. Caus. 25. qu. 1. cap. 11.*



*Constitutions against the Canons and Decrees of the Bishops of Rome, or against good manners, are of no moment.*  
*Constitutio contra bonos mores, nulla est momenti.* Distinct. 10. cap. 4.

Before that, Pope Gregory II. because the Eastern Emperor did cross the worship of Images, did withdraw Subjection from him, and did thrust his Authority out of Italy. He (saith Baronius) did effectually cause both the Romans and Italians to recede from Obedience to the Emperor.  
*An. 730. Tum Romanos tum Italos ab ejus obedientia recedere penitus fecit. Baron. Anno 730. § 40.*

This was an act in truth of Rebellion against the Emperor, in pretence of Jurisdiction over him; for how otherwise could he justify or colour the fact? So (as Baronius reflecteth) he did leave to posterity a worthy example, (forsooth,) that Heretical Princes should not be suffered to reign in the Church of Christ, if, being warned, they were found pertinacious in error.  
*Sic dignum posteris reliquit exemplum, ne in Ecclesia Christi regnare sinerentur heretici Principes, si saepe moniti, in errore persistere obstinato animo invenirentur. Baron. ibid.*

And no wonder he then was so bold, seeing the Pope had obtained so much respect in those parts of the World, that (as he told the Emperor Leo II.) all the Kingdoms of the West did hold Saint Peter as an earthly God: of which he might be able to seduce some to uphold him in his rebellious practices.  
*"Ον αὖ τῶν βασιλεῶν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως ὡς δὲ τὸν ἀρχαῖον ἔχουσιν. Greg. II. Epist. 1. Bin. Tom. 5: p. 508.*

This is the highest source, as I take it, to which this extravagant Doctrine can be driven. For that single passage of Pope Felix III. though much ancients will not amount to it. It is certain, that, in causes relating to God, 'tis the safest course for you, that according to his institution, ye endeavour to submit the will of the King to the Priests, &c.  
*Certum est rebus vestris hoc esse salutare, ut, cum de causis Dei agitur, juxta ipsius constitutionem, Regiam voluntatem Sacerdotibus Christi studeatis subdere, non preferre — Ec. P. Felix III. (Anno 483) dist. 10. cap. 3.*

For while the Emperor did retain any considerable Authority in Italy, the Popes were better advised than to vent such notions, and while they themselves did retain any measure of pious or prudent Modesty, they were not disposed to it. And we may observe divers Popes near that time in word and practice thwarting that practice. For instance,

Pope Gelasius, a vehement stickler for Papal Authority, doth say to the Emperor Anastasius, I, as being a Roman born, do love, worship, reverence thee as the Roman Prince. And he saith, that the Prelates of Religion (knowing the Empire conferr'd on him by Divine Providence) did obey his Laws. And otherwhere he discourseth, that Christ had distinguished by their proper acts and dignities the offices of Ecclesiastical and Civil Power, that one should not meddle with the other; so disclaiming Temporal Power due to himself, being content to screw up his Spiritual Authority.

*Te, sicut Romanus natus, Romanum Principem amo colo, suspicio. P. Gelas. 1. Epist. 8. (ad Anast. Imp.)*

*—cognoscentes imperium tibi superna dispositione collatum, legibus tuis ipsi quoque parent religionis Antistites. Ibid.*

*Christus, dispensatione magnifica temperans, sic actionibus propriis dignitatibusque distinctis officia Potestatis utriusque discrevit, &c.*

*Ad hoc potestas Dominorum meorum pietati celsitus data est super omnes homines.*

*Ego indignus famulus vester — Ego quidem jussioni subiectus.*

After him, as is well known, Pope Gregory I. (as became a pious and good man) did avow the Emperor for his Lord, by God's gift superiour to all men, to whom he was subject, whom he in duty was bound to obey;

obey; and supposed it a high presumption for any one to set himself above the honour of the Empire, by assuming the title of Universal Bishop.

After him, Pope Agatho, in the Acts of the sixth General Council, doth call the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus his Lord; doth avow himself together with all Presidents of the Churches servants to the Emperor; doth say, that his See and his Synod were subject to him, and did own Obedience to him.

Presently after him, Pope Leo II. who confirmed that General Synod, doth call the Emperor the prototype Son of the Church; and acknowledgeth the body of Priests to be servants (meanest servants) of his Royal Nobleness.

After him, Pope Constantine, (the immediate Predecessor of Pope Greg. II.) when the Emperor did command him to come to Constantinople, The most holy man, faith Anastasius in his Life, did obey the Imperial Commands.

*jussit eum ad Regiam ascendere urbem; qui sanctiss. vir jussis imperialibus obtemperans—Anast. in vit. P. Const.*

Yea, Pope Gregory II. himself, before his defection, (when perhaps the circumstances of time did not animate him thereto,) did, in his Epistle to Leo Isaurus, acknowledge him as Emperor to be the Head of Christians, and himself consequently subject to him.

This Gregory therefore may be reputed the Father of that Doctrine, which, being fostered by his Successors, was by Pope Gregory VII. brought up to its robust pitch and stature.

I know, Pope Gregory VII. to countenance him, doth alledge Pope Innocent I. excommunicating the Emperor Arcadius for his proceeding against St. Chrysostome: and the Writers of St. Chrysostome's Life, with others of the like age and credit, do back him therein. But seeing the Historians who lived in St. Chrysostome's own time, and who write very carefully about him, do not mention any such thing; seeing that, being the first Act in the kind, must have been very notable, and have made a great noise; seeing that story doth not sute with the tenor of proceedings, reported by those most credible Historians, in that case; seeing that fact doth no-wise sort to the condition and way of those Times; that report cannot be true, and it must be numbred among the many fabulous narrations, devised by some wanton Greeks, to set out the Life of that excellent Personage.

The same Pope doth also alledge St. Gregory M. denouncing Excommunication, and Deprivation of honour, to all Kings, Bishops, Judges, &c. who should violate the Privilege granted to the Monastery of St. Medard. But this (as are many such Privileges) is a rank Forgery, unworthily imposed on P. Gregory, (that prudent, meek and holy man,) much to his wrong and disgrace: which I will not be at trouble to confute, having shewed St. Gregory to have been of another judgment and temper, than to behave himself thus towards Princes; and seeing that task is abundantly discharged by that very learned man, Monsieur Launoy.

P. Greg. I. Ep. 2. 26.  
*Qui honori quoque Imperii vestri se per privatum vocabulum superponit. Ep. 4. 32.*

Anno 680.  
Λαρόν καὶ τέκνον. Αἱ. Syn. 6. p. 53.  
ἡμεῖς δούλοι τῆ βασιλείας. p. 304.  
ἡμετέρα δαυσία. p. 32.  
τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πρόεδροι οἱ δούλοι τοῦ  
Χριστιανικαῦτος ὡμῶν κερῆτος. p. 94.  
δουλικὸς ὡμῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς θρόνον.  
p. 64.  
ἐνεκὼν ὑπακοῆς, ἥς ὀφείλομεν. p. 33,  
34.

πρωτότυπον ἐκκλησίας τέκνον. Αἱ.  
Syn. VI. p. 303.  
ἡ βασιλικὴ ἐκλήνεια τοῖς ἐχάτοις ἰαυ-  
τῆς δούλοις συγκρατέσθαι. Ibid. p. 304.

Anno 709.  
Mist imp.  
ad Con-  
stantinum  
P. sacram,  
per quam  
P. Const.

ὡς βασι-  
λεὺς καὶ κα-  
θαλὴ τῆ  
Χριστιανῶν.  
P. Greg. II.  
ad Leon II.  
Ep. 1.  
(p. 502.)

Greg. VII. Epist. 8. 2.  
Baron. Anno 407. §. 23.  
Georg. Alex. vit. Chryf. cap. 68.  
Anon. vit. Chryf. cap. 39.  
Scrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Pal-  
ladius.

*Siquis autem Regum, Antistitem, Ju-  
dicum, vel quarumcumque secularium per-  
sonarum, hujus Apostolicæ auctoritatis, &  
nostræ præceptionis decreta violaverit,  
cujuscunque dignitatis vel sublimi-  
tatis sit, honore suo privetur.*  
Greg. M. post Epist. 38. libri 2.

Epist. pars  
VII.  
Indeed

Indeed (upon this occasion to digress a little farther) it doth not seem to have been the opinion of the ancient Popes, that they might excommunicate their Sovereign Princes: for if they might, why did they forbear to exercise that power, when there was greatest reason, and great temptation for it?

Why did not Pope *Julius* or Pope *Liberius* excommunicate *Constantius* the great Favourer of the *Arians*, against whom *Athanasius*, St. *Hilary*, and *Lucifer Calar.* do so earnestly inveigh, calling him Heretick, Antichrist, and what not? How did *Julian* himself escape the censure of Pope *Liberius*? Why did not Pope *Damasus* thunder against *Valens*, that fierce Persecutor of Catholics? Why did not *Damasus* censure the Empress *Justina*, the Patroness of *Arianism*? Why did not Pope *Siricius* censure *Theodosius I.* for that bloody fact, for which St. *Ambrose* denied him the Communion? How was it that Pope *Leo I.* (that stout and high Pope) had not the heart to correct *Theodosius Junior* in his way, who was the supporter of his adversary *Dioscorus*, and the obstinate protector of the second *Ephesine* Council, which that Pope so much detested? Why did not that Pope rather compel that Emperor to reason by censures, than supplicate him by tears? How did so many Popes connive at *Theodorick*, and other Princes professing *Arianism* at their door? Wherefore did not Pope *Simplicius* or Pope *Felix* thus punish the Emperor *Zeno*, the supplanter of the Synod of *Chalcedon*, for which they had so much zeal?

Why did neither Pope *Felix*, nor Pope *Gelasius*, nor Pope *Symmachus*, nor Pope *Hormisdas* excommunicate the Emperor *Anastasius*, (yea did not so much, Pope *Gelasius* faith, as touch his name,) for countenancing the Oriental Bishops in their

Schism, and refractory Non-compliance with the Papal Authority? Those Popes did indeed clash with that Emperor, but they expressly deny, that they did condemn him with others whom he did favour. We

*Quod sibi vult autem, quod dixerit Imperator à nobis se in religione damnatum, cum super hac parte decessor meus non solum minime nomen ejus attigerit--- P. Gelaf. I. Epist. 4.*

(faith Pope *Symmachus*) did not excommunicate thee, O Emperor, but *Acacius*.--- If you mingle your self, you are not excommunicated by us, but by your self. And, If the Emperor pleaseth to join himself with those condemned, (faith Pope *Gelasius*) it can not be imputed to us.

*Si te misces, non à nobis, sed à te ipso excommunicatus es. P. Symmachus I. Ep. 7. Si isti placet se miscere damnatis, nobis non potest imputari. P. Gelaf. I. Ep. 4.*

Baron.

Anno 503.

§. 17.

*Dicit quiddam mecum conspirantem Senatu, excommunicaverim te. Ista quidem ego (nego,) sed rationabiliter factum à decessoribus meis sine dubio subsequor. P. Sym. Epist. 7.*

You say, that I excommunicated you by the joint consent of the Senate. This I deny: but I undoubtedly follow what was with good reason done by my Predecessors.

Why do we not read that any Pope formally did excommunicate, though divers did zealously contradict and oppose, the Princes who did reject Images?

Lego &

relego Ro-

manorum

Regum &

any of them

before this was

excommunicated or

deprived of his

Kingdom by the

Imperatorum

gesta,

U

nusquam

invenio

quenquam

eorum

ante

hunc à

Romano

In fine, a noble Bishop above 500 years ago did say, *I read and read again the Records of the Roman Kings and Emperors, and I no where find that any of them before this was excommunicated or deprived of his Kingdom by the Roman Pontife.*

*U nusquam invenio quenquam eorum ante hunc à Romano Pontifice excommunicatum, vel Regno privatum. Otho Frising. Chron. lib. 6. cap. 35.*

Surely



Surely therefore the ancient Popes did either not know their Power, or were very negligent of their Duty.

Such have been the Doctrine and behaviour of Popes in reference to their Power.

§. V. This Doctrine of the Pope's Universal Power over all Persons in all Matters may reasonably be supposed the sentiment of all Popes continually for a long time, even for more than 500 years unto this present day. For,

1. If this Doctrine be false, it implieth no slight Error, but one of a very high nature and most dangerous consequence; which involveth great arrogance and iniquity, which tendeth to work enormous wrongs and grievous mischiefs: whence, if any Pope should conceive it false, he were bound openly to disclaim, to condemn, to refute it; lest the authority of his Predecessors, and his connivence, should induce others into it, or settle them in it; as it is (in regard to Pope *Honorius*) charged upon P. *Leo II.* who did not, as it became the Apostolical Authority, extinguish the flame of Heretical doctrine beginning, but did by neglecting cherish it. In such a case a Pope must not be silent: For, *No small danger* (saith P. *Gelasius*) lieth upon Popes in being silent about what agreeth to the service of God: and, if (saith P. *Paschal*) a Pope by his silence doth suffer the Church to be polluted with the gall of bitterness and root of impiety, he should no wise be excusable before the Eternal Judge: and Error (saith P. *Felix III.*) which is not resisted, (by those in eminent office,) is approved; and Truth which is not defended, is oppressed: and, He is not free from suspicion of a close society in mischief, who ceaseth to obviate it: and, We (saith P. *Gregory I.*) do greatly offend, if we do hold our peace at things that are to be corrected. But all Popes since the time specified have either openly declared for this Doctrine; or have been silent, and so have avowed it by tacit consent.

2. Any Pope disapproving that Tenent were bound to renounce communion with those that hold and profess it; or at least to check and discountenance it. But on the contrary they have suffered it to be maintained in their presence and audience; and have hugged that sort of Men with special favour, as their most affectionate and sure friends: they have suspected, discountenanced and frowned on those who have shewed dislike of it.

Those Men indeed who vouch this Doctrine, may reasonably be deemed to do it as accomplices with the Popes, on purpose to gratifie and curry favour with them, in hopes of obtaining reward and preferment of them for it.

*degeneri, Rom. 1. 32. They not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.*

3. The chief Authors and most zealous Abettors of these notions (Popes, Synods, Doctors of the School) have continually passed for most authentick Masters of Divinity, and have retained greatest authority in the Church governed and guided by the Pope.

4. The Decrees containing them do stand in their Canon-Law, and in their Collections of Synods, without any caution or mark of dislike; which

—cum Honorio, qui flammam hereticæ doctrinæ non, ut decuit Apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovxit, P. *Leo II.* Ep. 2.

Non leve discrimen incumbit Pontificibus siluisse pro divinitatis cultu quod congruit. P. *Gelas. I.* Epist. 8. (ad Anastas. Imp.)

Si vero nostro silentio pateremur Ecclesiam felle amaritudinis & impietatis radice pollui, quâ ratione possemus apud æternum Judicem excusari? P. *Paschal II.* Ep. 3. (ad Anselm. Cant.)

Error cui non resistitur, approbatur; & veritas quæ minime defensatur, opprimitur. P. *Felix III.* Ep. 1. (ad Acacium.)

Non caret scrupulo societatis occultæ, qui evidenter facinorosi desinit obviare. Id. ibid.

Si ea quæ nobis corrigenda sunt taceamus, valde delinquimus. P. *Greg. I.* Ep. 2. 37.

Οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐκείνους ποιεῖν τούτων τῶν

which is a sufficient indication of their constant adherence to this Doctrine.

5. The common style of the Papal Edicts or Bulls doth import their sense; which is imperious, in regard to all persons without exception: *Let no Man (say they) presume to infringe this our will and command, &c.*

6. Popes of all tempers and qualifications (even those who have passed for the most wise and moderate among them, have been ready to practise according to those principles, when occasion did invite, and circumstances of things did permit; interdicting Princes, absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, raising or encouraging Insurrections; as appeareth by their transactions not long since against our Princes, and those of France; which shews the very See imbued with those Notions.

7. They do oblige all Bishops most solemnly to avow this Doctrine, and to engage themselves to practise according to it. For in the Oath

*Mandata Apostolica totis viribus observabo, & ab aliis observari faciam.*

*Papatum Romanum & Regalia S. Petri adiutor eis ero ad retinendum & defendendum contra omnem hominem.*

*Hereticos, Schismaticos & Rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus praedictis pro posse persequar & impugnabo.*

prescribed to all Bishops they are required to avow, that they will observe the Apostolical commands with all their power, and cause them to be observed by others; that they will aid and defend the Roman Papacy and the Royalties of Saint Peter against every Man; that they will to their power persecute and impugn Hereticks, Schismaticks and Rebels to the Pope or his Successors, without any exception; which was I suppose chiefly meant against their own

Prince, (if occasion should be;) together with divers other points, importing their acknowledgment and abetting the Pope's universal Domination.

These horrible Oaths of Bishops to the Pope do seem to have issued from the same shop with the high *Hildebrandine* dictates: for the Oath in the Decretals is ascribed to Pope Gregory, (I suppose Greg. VII.) And in the sixth Roman Synod under Greg. VII. there is an Oath of like tenor exacted from the Bishops of *Aquileia*; perhaps occasionally, which in pursuance of that example might be extended to all.

And that before that time such Oaths were not imposed doth appear from hence, that when P. Paschal II. did require them from some great Bishops, (the Bishop of *Palermo*, and the Archbishop of *Poland*;) they did wonder and boggle at it as an uncouth Novelty; nor doth the Pope in favour of his demand alledge any ancient precedent, but only proposeth

some odd reasons, for it. *You have signified unto me, most dear Brother, that the King and his Nobles did exceedingly wonder, that an Oath with such a condition should be every where offered you by my Commissioners, and that you should & Regni take that Oath, which I had written, and they tendered to you.*

*Mayores admiratione permotos, quod passim tibi ab Apocrisiariis nostris tali conditione oblatum fuerit, si sacramentum quod a nobis scriptum detulerant, iurares, P. Pasch. II. Epist. 6.*

§. VI. All Romanists, in consistence with their Principles, do seem obliged to hold this opinion concerning the Pope's Universal Power. For, seeing many of their standing Masters and Judges of Controversies have so expressly from their Chair declared and defined it; all the Row for many Ages consenting to it and countenancing it; not one of them having signified any dissent or dislike of it: And considering that, if in any thing they may require or deserve belief, it is in this point; for in what are they more skilfull and credible than about the nature of their own Office? *What (saith Bellarmine wisely) may they be conceived to know better than the Authority of their own See?* Seeing it hath been approved by

*Ipsis precipue debet esse nota sua Sedis auctoritas.*  
Bell. 4. 3.



by their most great and famous Councils, which they hold Universal, and which their adored Synod of *Trent* doth alledge for such, (the *Laterane* under P. *Innocent* III. that of *Lions* under P. *Innocent* IV. the other *Laterane* under P. *Leo* X.) Seeing it hath been current among their Divines of greatest vogue and authority, the great Masters of their School: Seeing by so large a consent and concurrence, during so long a time, it may pretend (much better than divers other Points of great importance) to be confirmed by Tradition or Prescription: Why should it not be admitted for a Doctrine of the Holy Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches? How can they who disavow this Notion be true Sons of that Mother, or faithfull Scholars of that Mistress? How can they acknowledge any Authority in their Church to be infallible, or certain, or obliging to assent?

How can they admit the Pope for authentick Judge of Controversies, or Master of Christian Doctrine, or in any Point credible, who hath in so great a matter erred so foully, and seduced the Christian World; whom they desert in a Point of so great consideration, and influence on practice; whom they, by virtue of their dissent from him in this Opinion, may often be obliged to oppose in his proceedings?

How can they deny, that bad Doctrines might creep in, and obtain sway in the Church, by the interest of the Pope and his Clients?

How can they charge Novelty or Heterodoxy on those who refuse some Dictates of Popes, of Papal Councils, of Scholastick Divines, which stand upon no better grounds than those on which this Doctrine standeth?

Why hath no Synod, of the many which have been held in all parts of Christendom, clearly disclaimed this Opinion; but all have let it slip, or have seemed by silence to approve it?

Yea, how can the Concord and Unity of that Church well consist with a Dissent from this Doctrine? For,

No Man apprehending it false, seemeth capable with good conscience to hold Communion with those who profess it: for, upon supposition of its falshood, the Pope and his chief adherents are the teachers and abettors of the highest violation of Divine Commands, and most enormous sins, of Ulurpation, Tyranny, Imposture, Perjury, Rebellion, Murther, Rapine, and all the Villanies complicated in the practical influence of this Doctrine.

It seemeth clear as the Sun, that if this Doctrine be an Error, it is one of the most pernicious Heresies that ever was vented; involving the highest Impiety, and producing the greatest Mischief. For, If he that should teach Adultery, Incest, Simony, Theft, Murther, or the like Crimes, to be lawful, would be a Heretick; how much more would he be such, that should recommend Perjury, Rebellion, Regicide, (things inducing Wars, Confusions, Slaughters, Desolations, all sorts of Injustice and Mischief,) as Duties?

How then can any Man safely hold Communion with such persons? *An communicate with such, is to non est consent with them?* with P. *Gelasius*, that it is worse than ignorance of the truth to communicate with the enemies of truth? and, that He who communicateth with such an Heresie is worthily judged to be removed from our society?

*non sit deterius, & non ignorasse veritatem, & tamen communicasse cum veritatis inimicis. P. Gelas I. Ep. 1. Cuiusque heresi communicans merito iudicatur à nostra societate removendus. Ibid. Vide Ep. 13. p. 642.*

§. VII. Yet so loose and slippery are the Principles of the Party which

is jumbled in adherence to the Pope, that divers will not allow us to take this Tenent of Infinite Power to be a Doctrine of their Church; for divers in that Communion do not assent to it.

*Altera non tam sententia quam hæresis duo docet, primo, Pontificem ut* For there is a sort of Hereticks (as *Bellarmino* and *Baronius* call them) sculking every-where in the bosom of their Church, all about Christendom, and in some places stalking with open face, who restrain the Pope's Authority so far, as not to allow him any Power over Sovereign Princes in Temporal Affairs; much less any power of depriving them of their Kingdoms and Principalities.

*Pontificem ex jure Divino nullam habere temporalem potestatem, nec posse ullo modo imperare Principibus secularibus, nedum eos regnū & principatū privare*—Bell. V. 1.

*Herefis errore notantur omnes qui ab Ecclesia* They are all branded for Hereticks, who take from the Church of Rome, and the See of St. Peter, one of the two Swords, and allow only the Spiritual. This Heresie *Baronius* hath nominated the Heresie of the Politicks.

*Rom. cathedra Petri è duobus alterum gladium auferunt, nec nisi spiritualem concedunt.* Baron. Anno 1053. §. 14. *Herefis Politicorum*, Baron Anno 1073. §. 13.

This Heresie a great Nation, otherwise sticking to the Roman Communion, doth stiffly maintain, not enduring the Papal Sovereignty over Princes in Temporals to be preached in it.

There are many persons, yea, Synods, who did oppose Pope *Hildebrand* in the birth of his Doctrine, condemning it for a pernicious Novelty, and branding it with the name of Heresie: as we before shewed.

*Otto Frising. Sigebert. Abbas Ulsp. Occam, Marfilus Patav. &c.* Since the *Hildebrandine* Age there have been in every Nation (yea in Italy it self) divers Historians, Divines and Lawyers, who have in elaborate Tracts maintained the Royal Sovereignty against the Pontifical.

This sort of Hereticks are now so much encreased, that the *Hildebrandine* Doctrine is commonly exploded. Which, by the way, sheweth, that the Roman Party is no less than others subject to change its sentiments; Opinions among them gaining and losing vogue, according to circumstances of time and contingencies of things.

§. VIII. Neither are the adherents to the Roman Church more agreed concerning the extent of the Pope's Authority even in Spiritual matters.

For, although the Popes themselves plainly do claim an absolute Supremacy in them over the Church; although the stream of Divines who do flourish in favour with them doth run that way; although, according to their principles, (if they had any principles clearly and certainly fixed,) that might seem to be the Doctrine of their Church: Yet is there among them a numerous party, which doth not allow him such a Supremacy, putting great restraints to his Authority; (as we shall presently shew.) And as the other party doth charge this with Heresie, so doth this return back the same imputation on that.

§. IX. That their Doctrine is in this matter so various and uncertain, is no great wonder; seeing Interest is concerned in the question, and Principles are defective toward the resolution of it.

1. Contrary Interests will not suffer the Point to be decided, nor indeed to be freely disputed on either hand.

On one hand, the Pope will not allow his Prerogatives to be discussed; according to that maxim of the great Pope *Innocent III.* When there is a question touching the Privileges of the Apostolick See, we will not that others judge about them. Whence (as we before touched)

*Cum super privilegiis sedis Apostolica causa vertatur, nolumus de ipsis per alios judicari.* Greg. Decr. lib. 2. tit. 1. c. 12.

the Pope did peremptorily command his Legates at *Trent*, in no case to permit any dispute about his Authority.

On

On the other hand, the *French* will not permit the Supremacy of their King in Temporals, or the Privileges of their Church in Spirituals, to be contested in their Kingdom. Nor, we may suppose, would any Prince admit a Decision prejudicial to his Authority and Welfare, subjecting and enslaving him to the will of the *Roman Court*. Nor (we may hope) would any Church patiently comport with the irrecoverable oppression of all its rights and liberties by a peremptory establishment of Papal Omnipotency.

2. Nor is it easie for their Dissensions to be reconciled upon Theological grounds, and authorities to which they pretend deference. For, not only their Schools and Masters of their Doctrine do in the case disagree, but their Synods do notoriously clash.

§. X. Yea even Popes themselves have shifted their pretences, and varied in style, according to the different circumstances of time, and their variety of humours, designs, interests.

In time of prosperity and upon advantage, when they might safely do it, any Pope almost would talk high, and assume much to himself: but when they were low, or stood in fear of powerful contradiction, even the boldest Popes would speak submissly or moderately. As for instance, Pope *Leo I.* after the second *Ephesine* Synod, when he had to do with *Theodosius II.* did humbly supplicate, and whine pitifully; but after the Synod of *Chalcedon*, having got the Emperor favourable, and most of the Bishops complacent to him, he ranted bravely. And we may observe, that even Pope *Gregory VII.* who did swagger so boisterously against the Emperor *Henry*, was yet calm and mild in his contests with our *William* the Conqueror; who had a spirit good enough for him, and was far out of his reach.

And Popes of high spirit and bold face, (such as *Leo I. Gelasius I. Nic. I. Gregory II. Gregory VII. Innocent III. Boniface VIII. Julius II. Paul IV. Sextus V. Paulus V. &c.*) as they did ever aspire to scue Papal authority to the highest peg; so would they strain their language in commendation of their See as high as their times would bear. But other Popes of meeker and modester disposition, (such as *Julius I. Anastasius II. Gregory I. Leo II. Adrian VI. &c.*) were content to let things stand as they found them, and to speak in the ordinary style of their times; yet so, that few have let their Authority to go backward or decline.

We may observe, that the pretences and language of Popes have varied according to several periods, usually growing higher as their State grew looser from danger of opposition or controll.

In the first times, while the Emperors were Pagans, their pretences were suited to their condition, and could not soar high; they were not then so mad as to pretend to any Temporal Power, and a pittance of Spiritual eminency did content them.

When the Empire was divided, they could sometimes be more haughty and peremptory; as being in the West, shrowded under the wing of the Emperors there, (who commonly did affect to improve their Authority, in competition to that of other Bishops) and at distance from the reach of the Eastern Emperor.

The cause of *Athanasius* having produced the *Sardican* Canons, concerning the Revision of some causes by the Popes, by colour of them they did hugely enlarge their Authority, and raise their style; especially



ally in the West, where they had great advantages of augmenting their Power.

When the Western Empire was fallen, their influence upon that part of the Empire which came under protection of the Eastern Emperors rendering them able to do service or disservice to those Emperors, they, according to the state of Times and the need of them, did talk more big, or more tamely.

Pope *Boniface* III. having by compliance with the Usurper *Phocas* obtained a declaration from him concerning the Headship of the *Roman* Church, did make a considerable step forward toward the height of Papal Greatness.

After that Pope *Greg.* II. had withdrawn *Italy* from the Oriental Empire, and *Rome* had grown in a manner loose and independent from other secular powers; in the confusions of the West, the Pope interposing to arbitrate between Princes, trucking and bartering with them, as occasion served, for mutual aid and countenance, did grow in Power, and answerably did advance his pretences.

The spurious Decretal Epistles of the ancient Popes (which asserted to the Pope high degrees of Authority) being foisted into mens hands, and insensibly creeping into repute, did inspire the Pope with confidence to invade all the ancient Constitutions, Privileges and Liberties of Churches; and having got such interest every where, he might say what he pleased, no Clergy-man daring to check or cross him. Having drawn to himself the final decision of all Causes, having got a finger in disposal of all Preferments, having by Dispensations, Exemptions and Grants of privileges tyed to him so many Dependents, what might not he say or do?

Pope *Gregory* VII. being a Man of untameable Spirit, and taking advantage from the distractions and corruptions of his Times, did venture to pull a feather with the Emperor; and with success having mated him, did set up a peremptory claim to Sovereignty over all Persons in all Causes.

In his footsteps his Successors have trodden, being ever ready upon occasion to plead such a title, and to practise according to it. No Pope would forgoe any Power which had been claimed by his Predecessors. And Popes would ever be sure to have dancers after their pipe, numberless abettors of their pretences.

No wonder then that persons deferring much regard to the Authority of Popes, and accommodating their conceits to the dictates of them, (or of persons depending on them,) should in their opinions vary about the nature and extent of Papal Authority; it having never been fixed within certain bounds, or having in several Ages continued the same thing.

§. XI. Wherefore intending by God's help to discuss the pretended Authority of the Pope, and to shew that He by no Divine institution, and by no Immutable right, hath any such power as he doth claim; by reason of this perplexed variety of Opinions I do find it difficult to state the Question, or to know at what distinct mark I should level my Discourse.

§. XII. But seeing his pretence to any Authority in Temporals, or to the Civil Sword, is so palpably vain, that it hardly will bear a serious dispute, having nothing but impudence and sophistry to countenance it; seeing so many in the *Roman* Communion do reject it, and have substantially confuted it; seeing now most are ashamed of it, and very few,



ew, (even among those Sects, which have been its chief Patrons) will own it; seeing Bellarmine himself doth acknowledge it a Novelty, devised about 500 years ago in St. Bernard's time; seeing the Popes themselves, what-ever they think, dare now scarce speak out, and forbear upon sufficient provocation to practise according to it; I shall spare the trouble of meddling with it, confining my Discourse to the Pope's Authority in Ecclesiastical affairs; the pretence whereto I am persuaded to be no less groundless, and no less noxious than the other to Christendom; the which being overthrown, the other, as superstructed on it, must also necessarily fall.

§. XIII. And here the Doctrine which I shall contest against is that in which the Cordial partizans of that See do seem to consent, which is most common and current, most applauded and countenanced in their Theological Schools; which the Popes themselves have solemnly defined, and declared for standing law, or rule of Jurisdiction; which their most authentick Synods (whereby their Religion is declared, and distinguished from others) have asserted, or supposed; which the tenour of their Discipline and Practice doth hold forth; which their Clergy by most solemn professions and engagements is tied to avow; which all the Clients and Confidants of Rome do zealously stand for (more than for any other point of Doctrine;) and which no man can disclaim without being deemed an enemy, or a prevaricator toward the Apostolick See.

§. XIV. Which Doctrine is this, That (in the words of the Florentine Synod's Definition) *the Apostolical Chair and the Roman High-Priest doth hold a Primacy over the Universal Church; and that the Roman High-Priest is the Successor of St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles; and the true Lieutenant of Christ, and the Head of the Church; and that he is the Father and Doctor of all Christians; and that unto him in St. Peter full Power is committed to feed, and direct, and govern the Catholick Church under Christ; according as is contained in the Acts of General Councils, and in the Holy Canons.*

*En opéra-  
may & d'él-  
av d'insu-  
xluu xad-  
desp, &c.  
Concil.  
Flor. defin.  
p. 854.*

That (in the words of Pope Leo X. approved by the Laterane Synod) *Christ, before his departure from the world, did in solidity of the Rock institute Peter and his Successors, to be his Lieutenants, to whom it is so necessary to obey, that who doth not obey must die the death.*

*Christus migraturus ex mundo ad Patrem, in soliditate Petra Petrum ejus-  
que Successores vicarios suos instituit, qui-  
bus ex libri Regum testimonio ita obedire  
necesse est, ut qui non obedierit, morte mori-  
riatur. P. Leo X. in Conc. Later. Sess. 11.  
p. 151.*

That to the Pope as Sovereign Monarch, by Divine Sanction of the whole Church, do appertain Royal Prerogatives, (*Regalia Petri*, the Royalties of Peter they are called in the Oath prescribed to Bishops.) Such as these which follow;

To be Superiour to the whole Church, and to its Representative a General Synod of Bishops. To convocate General Synods at his pleasure; all Bishops being obliged to attend, upon summons from him. To preside in Synods, so as to suggest matter, promote, obstruct, over-rule the debates in them. To confirm or invalidate their Determinations, giving like to them by his assent, or subtracting it by his dissent. To define Points of Doctrine, or to decide Controversies authoritatively; so that none may presume to contest, or dissent from his Dictates. To enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, dispense with Ecclesiastical Laws and Canons. To relax or evacuate Ecclesiastical Censures by indulgence, pardon; &c. To void Promises, Vows, Oaths, Obligations to Laws

Bell. 4. 22. by his Dispensation. To be the Fountain of all Pastoral Jurisdiction and Dignity. To constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, reconcile Bishops. To confer Ecclesiastical Dignities and Benefices by paramount Authority, in way of Provision, Reservation, &c. To exempt Colleges, Monasteries, &c. from Jurisdiction of their Bishops and ordinary Superiors. To judge all persons in all Spiritual Causes, by calling them to his cognizance, or delegating Judges for them; with a final and peremptory Sentence. To receive Appeals from all Ecclesiastical Judicatories; and to reverse their Judgments, if he findeth cause. To be himself unaccountable for any of his doings, exempt from judgment, and liable to no reproof. To erect, transfer, abolish Episcopal Sees. To exact Oaths of Fealty and Obedience from the Clergy. To found Religious Orders; or to raise a Spiritual *Militia* for propagation and defence of the Church. To summon and commissionate Soldiers by Croisade, &c. to fight against Infidels, or persecute Infidels.

Some of these are expressed, others in general terms couched in those words of *P. Eugenius*, telling the *Greeks* what they must consent unto.

*The Pope* (said he) *will have the Prerogatives of his Church; and he will have Appeals to him; and to feed all the Church of Christ, as Shepherd of the Sheep. Beside these things, that he may have authority and power to convoke General Synods, when need shall be; and that all the Patriarchs do yield to his will.*

Οὐκ αὖτε τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ποι-  
μαίνει πάντας τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Χριστοῦ, ὡς ποιμὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης πρὸς τέτοις, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία καὶ δύναμις συγκα-  
τείν σύνοδον οἰκουμενικὴν, ὅτι διήκουν καὶ πάντας τοὺς πατριάρχας ἀπέκρινεν τῷ διλήματι αὐτῶν. Conc. Flor.  
p. 846.

That the Pope doth claim, assume and exercise a Sovereignty over the Church endowed with such Prerogatives, is sufficiently visible in experience of fact, is apparent by the authorized dictates in their Canon-law, and shall be distinctly proved by competent allegations, when we shall examine the branches of this pretended Authority.

In the mean time it sufficeth to observe, that in effect all Clergy-men do avow so much, who *bonâ fide* and without prevarication do submit to take the Oaths and Engagements prescribed to them of course by Papal appointment. For this surely, according to the Pope's meaning, (by which their obligation is to be measured,) is designed in the profes-

—*Romanôque Pontifici, B. Petri suc-*  
*cessori, ac Jesu Christi Vicario, veram*  
*obedientiam spondeo ac juro. Bull. Pii IV.*  
*super forme juram.*

Provisi de beneficiis — in *Romane*  
*Ecclesie obedientia se permanens sponde-*  
*ant ac jurent. Conc. Trid. Sess. 24.*  
*cap. 12.*

sion ordained by Pope *Pius IV.* wherein every beneficed Clergy-man is enjoined to say, *And I do promise and swear true Obedience to the Roman Pontif the Successor of St. Peter and the Vicar of Jesus Christ.* Which profession was appointed in pursuance of a Sanction made by the *Trent Council*, that all such persons should vow and swear to abide in Obedience to the *Roman Church*; and consequently, how hard soever its Yoke should

be, they would not shake it off: which inferreth most absolute Sovereignty of that Church, or of the Pope, who ruleth the roast in it.

But what that *true Obedience* doth import, or how far the Papal Authority in the Pope's own sense, and according to the publick spirit of that Church, doth stretch, is more explicitly signified in the Oath which all Bishops at their Consecration, and all Metropolitans at their Instalment,

are required to take; the which, as it is extant in the *Roman Pontifical*, set out by order of Pope *Clement VIII.* doth run in these terms.

Pontif. Rom. Antwerp. Anno 1626.  
p. 59. & p. 86.

I N.

I N. Elect of the Church of N. from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N. Pope N. and to his Successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do any thing that they may lose life or member, or that their Persons may be seized or hands any-wise laid upon them, or any injuries offer'd to them under any pretence whatsoever. The counsel which they shall intrust me withal, by themselves, their Messengers or Letters, I will not knowingly reveal to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the Roman Papacy, and the Royalties of St. Peter, saving my Order, against all Men. The Legate of the Apostolick See, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities, The rights, honours, privileges, and authority of the Holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his foresaid Successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase and advance. I will not be in any counsel, action or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church any thing to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state or power; and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can will signifie it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The Rules of the Holy Fathers, the Apostolick decrees, ordinances or disposals, reservations, provisions and mandates I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Hereticks, Schismatics, and Rebels to our said Lord or his foresaid Successors I will to my power persecute and oppose. I will come to a Council when I am call'd, unless I be hinder'd by a Canonical impediment. I will by my self in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord and his foresaid Successors of all my Pastoral Office, and of all things any wise belonging to the state of my Church, to the discipline of my Clergy and People, and lastly to the salvation of Souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and diligently execute the Apostolick commands. And if I be detain'd by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain Messenger hereto specially empower'd, a member of my Chapter, or some other in Ecclesiastical Dignity or else having a Parsonage; or in default of these, by a Priest of the Diocese; or in default of one of the Clergy [of the Diocese] by some other Secular or Regular Priest of approved Integrity and Religion, fully instructed in all things above-mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the foresaid Messen-

Ego N. Electus Ecclesie N. ab hac hora in antea fidelis & obediens ero B. Petro Apostolo, Sanctaeque Romanae Ecclesiae, & Domino nostro, Domino N. Papae N. suisque Successoribus canonice intrantibus. Non ero in consilio, aut consensu, vel facto, ut vitam perdant, aut membrum; seu capiantur mala captione; aut in eos manus quomodolibet ingerantur; vel iniuria aliqua inferantur, quovis quæsito colore. Consilium verò quod mihi credituri sunt, per se, aut Nuncios suos, seu literas, ad eorum damnum, me sciente, nemini pandam. Papatum Romanum & Regalia Sancti Petri adjutor eis ero ad defendendum & retinendum, salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem. Legatum Apostolicæ Sedis in eundo & redeundo honorifice tractabo, & in suis necessitatibus adjuvabo. Jura, honores, privilegia, & auctoritatem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesie, Domini nostri Papæ & Successorum prædictorum, conservare, defendere, augere, promovere curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu in quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel præjudicialia personarum, juris, honoris, status & potestatis eorum machinentur. Et si talia à quibuscunque tractari vel procurari novero, impediam hoc posse, & quanto citius potero significabo eidem Domino nostro, vel alteri per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam pervenire. Regulas Sanctorum Patrum, decreta, ordinationes, seu dispositiones, reservationes, provisiones & mandata Apostolica totis viribus observabo, & faciam ab aliis observari. Hæreticos, Schismaticos & Rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel Successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar & impugnabo. Vocatus ad Synodum veniam, nisi prædictus fuero canonice præpeditio. Apostolorum limina singulis trienniis personaliter per me ipsum visitabo, & Domino nostro ac Successoribus præfatis rationem reddam de toto meo pastoralis officio ac de rebus omnibus ad meam Ecclesiam statum, ad cleri, & populi disciplinam, animarum denique quæ meæ fidei traditæ sunt, salutem quovis modo pertinentibus, & vicissim mandata Apostolica humiliter recipiam & quam diligentissime exequar. Quod si legitimo impedimento detentus fuero præfata omnia adimplebo per Certum Nuncium ad hoc speciale mandatum habentem de gremio mei Capiculi, aut alium in dignitate Ecclesiastica constitutum, seu aliis personatum habentem; aut, his mihi deficientibus, per diocesani Sacerdotem; & clero deficiente omnino per aliquem alium Presbyterum secularem vel regularem spectatæ probitatis & religionis de supradictis omnibus plenè instructum. De hujusmodi autem impedimento docebo per legitimas probationes ad Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesie Cardinalem Proponentem in Congregatione Sacri Concilii per supradictum Nuncium transmittendas. Possessiones verò ad mensam meam pertinentes non recipiam, nec donabo neque impignorabo, nec de novo infeudabo



vel aliquo modo alienabo, etiam cum consensu Capituli Ecclesie mee, inconsulto Romano Pontifice. Et si ad aliquam alienationem devenero, penas in quadam super hoc edita constitutione contentas eo ipso incurrere volo. Sic me Deus adjuvet & hæc Sancta Dei Evangelia.

ger to the Cardinal Proponent of the Holy Roman Church in the Congregation of the Sacred Council. The Possessions belonging to my Table I will neither sell nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor any wife alienate, no not even with the consent of the Chapter of my Church, without consulting the Roman

Pontife. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the Penalties contain'd in a certain Constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and the Holy Gospels of God.

Such is the Oath prescribed to Bishops, the which is worth the most serious attention of all Men, who would understand how miserably slavish the condition of the Clergy is in that Church, and how inconsistent their obligation to the Pope is with their duty to their Prince.

Gregor.  
Decret. lib.  
2. tit. 24.  
cap. 4.

And in perusing it we may note, that the clauses in a different character are in the more ancient Oath extant in the Gregorian Decretals: by which it appeareth how the Pope doth more and more enlarge his Power, and straiten the bands of Subjection to him. And it is very remarkable that the new Oath hath chang'd those words *REGULAS SANCTORUM PATRUM* into *REGALIA SANCTI PETRI*, i. e. *THE RULES OF THE HOLY FATHERS* into *THE ROTALTIES OF SAINT PETER*.

§. XV. I know there are within the Roman Communion great store of Divines, who do contract the Papal Sovereignty within a much narrower compass, refusing to him many of those Prerogatives, yea scarce allowing to him any of them.

There are those who affirm the Pope, in Doctrine and Discipline, subject to the Church, or to a General Synod representing it. Which opinion thwarteth a proposition, in Bellarmine's opinion, e'en almost an Article of Faith: but to be even with him, they do hold his proposition to be quite heretical: *The Pope is simply and absolutely above the Universal Church—this proposition is almost an Article of Faith*, saith Bellarmine: The Cardinal of Lorrain on the contrary, But I (saith he) cannot deny but that I am a French-man, and bred up in the Church of Paris, which teaches that the Roman Pontife is subject to a Council, and they who teach the contrary are there branded as Hereticks.

\* Summus Pontifex simpliciter & absolute est supra Ecclesiam Universam; hæc propositio est ferè de fide. Bell. de Conc. 2. 17.

Ego verò negare non possum quin Gallus sim, & Parisiensis Ecclesie alumnus, in quâ Rom. Pontificem subesse concilio teneatur, & qui docent ibi contrarium, si tanquam hæretici notantur. Card. Loth. apud Laun. Ep. 1. 1.

\* Quæ sententia videtur omnino erronea & hæretici proxima. Bell. 4. 2.

There are those who affirm the Pope, if he undertake Points of Faith without assistance of a General Synod, may teach Heresie: (\*which opinion, as Bellarmine thought, doth closely border on Heresie:) And those who conceive that Popes may be, and have been Hereticks; whence Christians sometimes are not obliged to admit their Doctrine, or observe their pleasure.

There are those who maintain the Pope, no less than other Bishops, subject to the Canons, or bound to observe the Constitutions of the Church; that he may not infringe them, or over-rule against them, or dispense with them: and that to him attempting to do so obedience is not due.

There are those who maintain, that the Pope cannot subvert or violate the Rights and Liberties of particular Churches, settled in them agreeably to the ancient Canons of the Church Universal.

There are those who assert to General Councils a power of Reforming the Church, without or against the Pope's consent.

There



There are those who (as *Bellarmino* telleth us) do allow the Pope to be no more in the Ecclesiastical Republick, than as the Duke of *Venice* in his Senate, or as the General of an Order in his Congregation; and that he therefore hath but a very limited and subordinate Power.

There are consequently those who conceive the Pope notoriously erring, or misdemeaning himself to the prejudice of the Christian State, may be called to an account, may be judged, may be corrected, may be discarded by a General Synod.

Such notions have manifestly prevailed in a good part of the *Roman* Communion, and are maintained by most Divines in the *French* Church; and they may be supposed every-where common, where there is any liberty of judgment, or where the Inquisition doth not reign.

There have been seasons wherein they have so prevailed, as to have been defined for Catholick Truths in great Synods, and by them to have been applied to practice. For,

In the first great Synod of *Pisa* it was declared, that Councils may *re-*  
*reform the Church sufficiently both in Head and Members:* and according-  
 ly that Synod did assume to judge two Popes (*Gregory XII.* and *Bene-*  
*dict XIII.*) contending for the Papacy, (whereof one was the true Pope,)  
 and deposing them both, did substitute *Alexan-*  
*der V.* who for one year (as *Antoninus* reporteth)  
 according to the common opinion did hold the Seat  
 of Peter.

An. 1409.  
Conc. Pis.  
Sess. 16, 17.

*Qui anno uno sedem Petri tenuit, se-*  
*cundum communem opinionem.* Anton. de  
 Concil. Pis. cap. 5. §. 3.

The Synod of *Constance* declared, that the Synod lawfully assembled in the  
 Holy Ghost, making a General Council representing the Catholick Church mili-  
 tant, hath immediately power from Christ; to which every one, of whatever  
 state or dignity he be, although it be Papal, is bound to obey in those things which  
 belong to Faith, and the extirpation of (the said) Schism, and the general  
 reformation of the Church of God in Head and Members.

Primò de-  
 clarat  
 quod ipsa  
 Synodus  
 &c. Sess. 4.  
 & 5.

The which Doctrine they notably put in practice, exercising jurif-  
 diction over Popes, and for Errors, Misdemeanors, or Contumacies  
 discarding three (of whom it is hard if one were not true Pope,) and  
 chusing another, who afterward did pass for a right Pope, and himself  
 did confirm the Acts of that Council. (So that this Semi-heresie hath  
 at least the authority of one Pope to countenance it.) Our most holy Lord  
 the Pope said in answer thereunto, that he would maintain and inviolably observe  
 all and every of those things that were conciliarly determin'd, concluded and  
 decreed by the present Council in matters of Faith.

*Dominus*  
*noster Pa-*  
*pa dixit,*  
*responden-*  
*do ad præ-*

*dicta, quod omnia & singula determinata, conclusa & decreta in materiis fidei per præsens concilium concilia-*  
*riter tenere, & inviolabiliter observare volebat.* Conc. Const. Sess. 45. p. 1119.

The Synod of *Basil* declared the same Point,  
 that Councils are superiour to Popes, to be a truth of  
 Catholick Faith, which whoever doth stiffly oppose is to  
 be accounted a Heretick: Nor (say they) did any  
 skilful Man ever doubt the Pope to be subject to the  
 judgment of General Synods in things concerning Faith.  
 In virtue of which Doctrine, and by its irresistible au-  
 thority, the Synod did sentence and reject Pope  
*Eugenius* as criminal, heretical and contumacious.

*Veritas de potestate Concilii supra Pa-*  
*pam—est veritas fidei Catholica—*  
*cui pertinaciter repugnans est censendus*  
*hereticus.* Conc. Bas. Sess. 33. (p. 95.)

*Nec unquam aliquis perstorum dubita-*  
*vit, summum Pontificem in his qua fidem*  
*concernunt judicio earundem generalium*  
*Synodorum esse subiectum.* Concil. Bas.  
 Sess. 45. p. 117.

*Vigore cujus, ac ineffabili & inexpug-*  
*nabili auctoritate—*Sess. 38. p. 101.

These Synods, although reprobated by Popes \* in Counter-synods, \* (Concil.  
 are yet by many *Roman* Catholick Divines retained in great veneration;  
 and their Doctrine is so current in the famous *Sorbonne*, that (if we may be-  
 lieve the great Cardinal of *Lorrain*) the contrary is there reputed heretical.

*Ego verò*  
*negare non*  
*possum, &c.*

§. XVI. Yet notwithstanding these oppositions, the former Opinion averring the Pope's absolute Sovereignty, doth seem to be the genuine Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, if it hath any.

*Nam ad-  
huc vide-  
mus ab Ec-  
clesia tol-  
rari, qui  
eam sen-  
tentiam  
sequun-  
tur —*  
Bell. 4. 2.

For those Divines by the Pope and his intimate Confidants are looked upon as a mongrel brood, or mutinous faction; which he by politick connivence doth only *tolerate*, because he is not well able to correct or suppress them. He is afraid to be violent in reclaiming them to his sense, lest he spend his artillery in vain, and lose all his power and interest with them.

Nor indeed do those Men seem to adhere to the *Roman Party* out of entire judgment or cordial affection; but in compliance with their Princes, or upon account of their Interest, or at best with regard to peace and quiet. They cannot conveniently break with the Pope, because his Interest is twisted with their own, so as not easily to be disentangled.

For how can they heartily stick to the Pope, whenas their Opinion doth plainly imply him to be an Usurper and a Tyrant, (claiming to himself, and exercising authority over the Church, which doth not rightfully belong to him;) to be a Rebel and Traitor against the Church, (invading and possessing the Sovereignty due to it; for such questionless the Duke of *Venice* would be, should he challenge and assume to himself such a Power over his Commonwealth, as the Pope hath over Christendom;) to be an Impostor and Seducer, pretending to infallible conduct, which he hath not.

How can they honestly condemn those who (upon such grounds) do shake off such yokes, refusing to comply with the Pope, till he correct his Errors, till he desist from those Usurpations and Impostures, till he restore to the Church its Rights and Liberties?

How are the Doctrines of those Men consistent or congruous to their practice? For they call the Pope Monarch of the Church, and Universal Pastor of Christians, by God's appointment, indefectibly; yet will they not admit all his Laws, and reject Doctrines which he teacheth, particularly those which most nearly touch him, concerning his own Office and Authority. They profess themselves his loyal Subjects, yet pretend Liberties which they will maintain against him. They hold that all are bound to entertain Communion with him, yet confess that he may be heretical, and seduce into Error. They give him the name and shadow of a Supremacy, but so that they void the substance and reality thereof.

*Manifestum autem Schismatis argu-  
mentum est, cum quis se communioni sub-  
trahit Apostolica sedes. Baul. not. ad  
Agobard. p. 112.*

It is a manifest Argument of Schism, when any Man withdraws himself from Communion with the Apostolick See.

In fine, where should we seek for the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*, but at *Rome*, or from *Rome* it self? Where these Doctrines are Heterodoxies.

§. XVII. We shall not therefore have a distinct regard to the Opinion of these *Semi-romanists*; nor consider them otherwise, than to confirm that part of Truth which they hold, and to confute that part of Error which they embrace; allowing, at least in word and semblance, more power to the Pope, than we can admit as due to him. Our discourse shall be levelled at him as such as he pretendeth himself to be, or as assuming to himself the forementioned Powers and Prerogatives.

§. XVIII. Of such vast Pretences we have reason to require sufficient Grounds. He that demandeth assent to such important Assertions, ought to produce clear proofs of them: He that claimeth so mighty Power, should

should be able to make out a good Title to it; for *No Man may take this* Heb. 5. 4. (more than Pontifical) honour to himself, but he that is called by God, as was Aaron. They are worthily to be blamed, who tumultuously and disorderly fall upon curbing or restraining those who by no law are subject to them.

*Fure culpandi sunt, qui turbidè atque inordinatè in eos coercendos insiliunt, qui nullà sibi lege subiecti sunt. Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 17.*

We cannot well be justified from a stupid Easiness, in admitting such a Lieutenantcy to our Lord, if we do not see exhibited to us manifest and certain Patents assuring its Commission to us. We should love the Church better, than to yield up its Liberty to the will of a Pretender, upon slight or no ground. Their boldly claiming such a Power, their having sometime usurped such a Power, will not excuse them or us. Nor will precarious Assumptions, or subtil Distinctions, or blind Traditions, or loose Conjectures serve for probations in such a case.

*Nemo sibi & professor & testis est. Tertul. 5. 1. adv. Marc.*  
None can be both a Claimer and a Witness for himself.

§. XIX. Such demands they cannot wholly balk: wherefore for satisfaction to them, not finding any better plea, they hook in St. Peter; affirming that on him by our Lord there was instated a Primacy over his brethren, all the Apostles and the Disciples of our Lord, importing all the Authority which they claim; and that from him this Primacy was devolved by succession to the Bishops of Rome, by right indefectible for all future Ages.

Which Plea of theirs doth involve these main Suppositions,

- I. That St. Peter had a Primacy over the Apostles.
- II. That St. Peter's Primacy with its Rights and Prerogatives was not personal but derivable to his Successors.
- III. That St. Peter was Bishop of Rome.
- IV. That St. Peter did continue Bishop of Rome, after his Translation, and was so at his decease.
- V. That the Bishops of Rome (according to God's Institution, and by original right derived thence) should have an Universal Supremacy and Jurisdiction over the Christian Church.
- VI. That in fact the Roman Bishops continually from St. Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this Sovereign Power.
- VII. That this Power is indefectible and unalterable.

The Truth and Certainty of these Propositions we shall in order discuss; so that it may competently appear, whether those who disclaim these Pretences are (as they are charged) guilty of Heresie and Schism; or they rather are liable to the imputations of Arrogancy and Impiety who do obtrude and urge them.



A  
TREATISE  
OF THE  
Pope's Supremacy.

MATTH. X. 2.

πρῶτος Σίμων. Now the Names of the twelve Apostles were these; the first, Simon, who is called Peter.

**A**MONG the Modern Controversies there is scarce any of greater consequence, than that about Universal Supremacy, which the Bishop of Rome claimeth over the Christian Church; the assertion whereof on his side dependeth upon divers *Suppositions*; namely these.

I. That Saint Peter by our Lord's appointment had a Primacy, implying a Sovereignty of Authority and Jurisdiction over the Apostles.

II. That the Rights and Prerogatives of this Sovereignty were not personal, but derivable, and transmitted to Successors.

III. That Saint Peter was Bishop of Rome.

IV. That Saint Peter did continue Bishop of Rome after his Translation, and was so at his decease.

V. That hence of Right to the Bishops of Rome, as Saint Peter's Successors, an Universal Jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ doth appertain.

VI. That in Fact the said Bishops continually from Saint Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this Power.

VII. That this Power is indefectible; such as by no means can be forfeited or fail.

In order to the discussion and resolution of the first Point, I shall treat upon the Primacy of Saint Peter; endeavouring to shew what Primacy he was capable of, or might enjoy; what he could not pretend to, nor did possess.

I. SUP-

## SUPPOSITION. I.

The first Supposition of those who claim Universal Jurisdiction to the Pope over the Church, is, *That Saint Peter had a Primacy over the Apostles.*

**I**N order to the resolution of this Point, we may consider, that there are several kinds of Primacy, which may belong to a Person in respect of others: for there are;

1. *A Primacy of Worth, or Personal Excellency.*
2. *A Primacy of Reputation and Esteem.*
3. *A Primacy of Order, or bare Dignity and Precedence.*
4. *A Primacy of Power or Jurisdiction.*

To each of these what Title Saint Peter might have, let us in order examine.

**I.** As for the first of these (*a Primacy of Worth, or Merit*, as some of the Ancients call it) we may well grant it to Saint Peter, admitting that probably he did exceed the rest of his Brethren in personal Endowments and Capacities, (both natural and moral) qualifying him for the discharge of the Apostolical Office in an eminent manner; particularly that in quickness of apprehension, in boldness of spirit, in readiness of speech, in charity to our Lord, and zeal for his Service, in resolution, activity and industry he was transcendent, may seem to appear by the tenour of the Evangelical and Apostolical Histories; in the which we may observe him upon all occasions ready to speak first, and to make himself *the mouth* (as the *Fathers* speak) of the Apostles, in all deliberations nimble at propounding his advice, in all undertakings forward to make the onset; being πάνταχ' ὁρμῶς, *always hot and eager, always prompt and vigorous*, as St. Chrysostom often affirmeth concerning him: these things are apparent in his demeanour, and it may not be amiss to set down some instances.

When our Lord observing the different apprehensions men had concerning him, asked the Apostles, *but whom say ye that I am*, up starteth he, προηδὲ καὶ προλαμβάνεται, *he skippeth forth, and preventeth the rest*, crying, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* The other Apostles were not ignorant of the Point; for they at their Conversion did take Jesus for the *Messias*, which (even according to the common Notion of the *Jews*) did imply his being the Son of God; *Nathanael* (that is, Saint *Bartholomew*, as is supposed) had in terms confessed it; the whole company, upon seeing our Lord walk on the Sea, had avowed it; Saint Peter before that, in the name of them all had said, ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν, *We have believed, and have known*, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. They therefore had the same Faith, but he from a special alacrity of spirit, and expedition in utterance, was more forward to declare it; *He was more hot* (saith St. Greg. Naz.) *than the rest at acknowledging Christ.*

Ἐνταῦθα δὲ αἱ πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κακάρταται· ὁ μετὰ τοὺς αἰσθῆσις τὸν δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν. Cyrill. in Joh. 21. 15. He was a very active and stirring man, exceedingly spur'd on with much promptness and alacrity in doing and speaking.

Πάνταχ' ὁρμῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁρμῶν. Chryl. in Joh. Or. 12. (13. 24.) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν. Chrylost. Tom. 5. Oras. 59.

Licet ceteri Apostoli sciant, Petrus tamen respondet pro ceteris. Ambr. in Luc. lib. 6. cap. 9.

Joh. 1. 42. Matt. 26. 63. Joh. 1. 50. Matt. 14. 33. Joh. 6. 69.

Θεμώτερος τῶν ἄλλων οἷς ἐπίγνωσιν Χριστοῦ. Greg. Naz. Or. 34.

Matt. 14. 28. When our Saviour walked on the Sea, who but He had the Faith and the Courage to venture on the Waters towards him ?

J. 1. 18. 10. When our Lord was apprehended by the Souldiers, presently up was his spirit, and out went his Sword in defence of him.

Matt. 26. 33-35. When our Lord predicted, that upon his coming into trouble all the Disciples would be offended, and desert him; he was ready to say, *Though all men should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended*; and, *Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee*; such was his natural courage and confidence.

Matt 16. 22. When our Lord was discoursing about his Passion, he suddenly must be advising in the case, and urging him to spare himself; upon which

St. Chrysostom biddeth us to consider, *not that his answer was unadvised, but that it came from a genuine and fervent affection.*

Mk. 9. 6. And at the Transfiguration, he fell to proposing about making an abode there, *not knowing what he said*; so brisk was he in imagination and speech.

Luk. 24. 12-31. Upon the good Womans report that our Lord was risen from the dead, he first ran to the Sepulchre, and so (as Saint Paul implieth) did obtain the first sight of our Lord after the Resurrection; such was his zeal and activity upon all occasions.

1 Cor 15. 5. *And that he appeared to Cephas, after that to the twelve.*

Acts 1. 15. At the Consultation about supplying the place of Judas, he rose up, proposed, and pressed the matter.

Acts 15. 7. At the Convention of the Apostles and Elders about resolving the debate concerning observance of Mosaical Institutions, he first rose up, and declared his sense.

In the Promulgation of the Gospel, and Defence thereof before the Jewish Rulers, he did assume the conduct, and constantly took upon him to be the Speaker; the rest standing by him, implying assent, and ready to avow his word; Peter (saith Saint Luke), *standing with the rest lift up his voice, and said unto them*; so did they utter a common voice, (saith St. Chrys.) *and he was the mouth of all.*

Aug. in Joh. Tract. 123. *Ο μανικὸς ἐρῶν τὸ Χριστόν.* Chrys. Tom. 5. Or. 24. An extreme lover of Christ.

*Sape diximus nimis ardoris, amorisq; quam maximi fuisse Petrum in Dominum.* Hier. in Mat. 16. 22.

We have often said that Peter was transported with too much heat, and extraordinary great love of our Lord.

*Ipsē enim Petrus in Apostolorum ordine primus, in Christi amore promptissimus, saepe unus respondet pro omnibus.* Aug. Sermon. 13. de verb. Dom. in Matt. 1.

For Peter himself being first in the Order of the Apostles, and most prompt and forward in the Love of Christ, answer'd oftentimes alone for all the rest.

That in affection to our Lord, and zeal for his service, Saint Peter had some advantage over the rest, that Question, *Simon Peter, dost thou love me more than these?* may seem to imply: (although the words *πλεον τῶν* may bear other interpretations, whereby the seeming invidiousness of the Question according to that sense will be removed.) However, that he had a singular zeal for promoting our Lord's service, and propagation of the Gospel, therein outshining the rest, seemeth manifest in the History, and may be inferred from the peculiar regard our Lord apparently did shew to him.

Upon these Premises we may well admit that Saint Peter had a Primacy of Worth; on that in personal accomplishments he was most eminent among the twelve Apostles; (although afterward there did spring up one, who hardly in any of these respects would yield to him; who could confidently say, *That*



That he did not come behind the very chief Apostles : and of whom St. Ambrose saith, \* Neither was Paul inferior to Peter — being well to be compared even to the first, and second to none : and St. Chrysostom, † For what was greater than Peter, and what equal to Paul? This is the Primacy which Eusebius attributeth to him, when he calleth him, the excellent and great Apostle, who for his virtue was the Prologuitor of all the rest.

II. As to a Primacy of Repute ; which Saint Paul meaneth, when he speaketh of the οἱ δεικνύσιν, those which had a special reputation, of those Gal 2.2,6. who seemed to be Pillars, of the ὑπὲρ λίαν Ἀποστολοι, the supereminent Apostles, Gal 2.9. this advantage cannot be refused him ; being a necessary consequent of 2 Cor. 11. 5, 12, 11. those eminent qualities resplendent in him, and of the illustrious performances achieved by him, beyond the rest.

This may be inferred from that advantageous renown, which he hath had propagated from the beginning to all posterity.

This at least those elogies of the Fathers (styling him the Chief, Prince, Head of the Apostles) do signify.

Ὁ ἐπικρατέστατος τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πέτρος.  
Ath. disp. c. Arium, p. 121.

This also may be collected from his being so constantly ranked in the first place, before the rest of his Brethren.

III. As to a Primacy of Order, or bare Dignity, importing, that commonly in all meetings and proceedings the other Apostles did yield him the precedence, the προσηγορία or privilege of speaking first (whether in propounding matters for debate, or in delivering his advice) in the conduct and moderation of affairs ; that this was stated on him, may be questioned ; for that this were a kind of womanish privilege ; and that it doth not seem to besit the gravity of such persons, or their condition and circumstances to stand upon ceremonies of respect ; for that also our Lords Rules do seem to exclude all semblance of ambition, all kinds of inequality, and distance between his Apostles ; for that this practice doth not seem constantly and thoroughly to agree to his being endowed with this advantage ; especially seeing all that practice which favoureth it, may fairly be assigned to other causes ; for that also the Fathers Authority (if that be objected, as a main argument of such a Primacy) in points of this nature, not bordering on essentials of Faith, is of no great strength ; they in such cases speaking out of their own ingeny and conjecture ; and commonly indulging their imaginations no less freely than other men.

But yet this Primacy may be granted, as probable upon divers accounts of use and convenience ; it might be useful to preserve order, and to promote expedition, or to prevent confusion, distraction, and dilatory obstruction in the management of things ; yea to maintain concord, and to exclude that ambition or affectation to be foremost, which is natural to men.

For seeing all could not go, speak, or act first, all could not guide affairs, it was expedient that one should be ready to undertake it, knowing his cue ; See (saith St. Chrysostom, noting on Act. 2. 14. where Saint Peter speaketh for the rest) the concord of the Apostles ; they yield unto him the speech, for they could not all speak ; and One (saith St. Hierom) is chosen among the twelve, that a head being appointed, an occasion of Schism might be removed.

Σκόπει τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἡ ὁμοφωνία, αὐτοὶ διαχωρίζον αὐτῷ τὴν ἡμιμαχίαν, ἵνα ᾖ ὁ ἕκαστος πᾶσι φεγγάδιον. Chryl. in Act. 2. 14.

Inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto Schismatis tolleretur occasio. Hier. in Jovin. I. cap. 14.

St. Cyprian,

Cyp. Ep.  
73. de u-  
nit. Eccl.  
Ec.

In typo u-  
nitatū—  
Aug. de  
Bapt. 3. 17.

Petrus—  
naturā  
unius homo

erat, gratiā unus Christianus, abundantiore gratiā unus idēq; primus Apostolus. Aug. in Joh. tract. 123.

Peter was by nature one Man, by grace one Christian, by a more abundant grace one and the same prime Apostle.

Ipse enim Petrus in Apostolorum ordine primus, in Christi amore promptissimus, saepe unus respondet pro omni-  
bus. Aug. de verbis Dom. sup. Mat. 1. Sermon. 13.

For Peter himself being the first in the Order of the Apostles, the most forward in the love of Christ, he alone oft times answers for all the rest.

1. It is probable, that Saint Peter was first in standing among the Apostles; I mean not that he was the first Disciple, or first converted to Faith in Christ; but first called to the Apostolical Office; or first nomi-

[Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἁποστόλων, διότι  
καὶ ἐπετάχθησαν. Theoph. in Matt. 10.]  
Luke 6. 14. Matt. 4. 18.  
Mark 1. 16. Luke 5. 3.

\* Γενόμενος τις ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἄρχιεπίσκοπος, ἐκλήθητο Πέτρος ἀρχιεπίσκοπος. Epiph. her. 51.

Primus credidit, & Apostolatus est Princeps. Hil. in Matt. Can. 7.

Quem primum Dominus elegit. Cyp. Ep. 71.

Ὁ πρῶτος τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπελεγείας. Bas. de Judicio Dei, Tom. 2. p. 268.

Ἀπαρτὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων. Modest. apud Phot. Cod. 275. Clem. ad Jac.

Hier. in Jovin. 1.

nated by our Lord, when out of all his Disciples he chose twelve and called them Apostles; Simon whom he called Peter, and Andrew his Brother — He was one of the first Believers at large; he was perhaps the first, that distinctly believed our Lord's Divinity; he was probably the very first Apostle; \* as the fittest Person in our Lord's eye for that employment. He (saith St. Hilary) did first believe, and is the Prince (or first man) of the Apostleship. He (saith St. Cyprian) was the first, whom the Lord chose. He (saith St. Basil) was by judgment preferred before all the Disciples. He by other Ancients is called the first-fruits of the Apostles. And according to this sense St. Hierom (I suppose) doth call

him, and his Brother Andrew, Principes Apostolorum, that is (according to frequent usage of the word Princeps in Latin) the first of the Apostles.

So that as in divers Churches, (perhaps when time was, in all) anciently priority in ordination did ground a right to precedence, as it is in ours, with some exception; so might Saint Peter upon this account of being first ordained Apostle, obtain such a Primacy.

2. Saint Peter also might be the first in age; which among Persons otherwise equal is a fair ground of preference; for he was a married

Luk. 4. 38. Man; and that before he was called, as is intimated in Saint Luke; and  
5. 7. may be inferred from hence, that he would not have married after that  
Matt. 19. he had left all, and devoted himself to follow our Lord. Upon which ac-  
27. count of Age St. Hierom did suppose that he was

Sed cur non Joannes electus est virgo? etati clarum est, quia Petrus senior erat; ne adhuc adolescens & pene puer progressa etatis hominibus preferretur. Hier. in Jovin. 1. 14.

Μικρότερον ἄρτι τῶν Πέτρῳ τῷ Χριστῷ ἐκλήθη. Epiph. her. 51.

Peter being the younger in age.

preferred before the beloved Disciple; why (saith he) was not Saint John elected, being a Batchelour? it was deferred to age, because Peter was elder, that a youth and almost a boy might not be preferred before men of good age.

I know that Epiphanius affirmeth St. Andrew to have been the elder Brother; but it doth not appear whether he saith it from conjecture, or upon any other ground. And his Authority, although we should suppose

pose it bottomed on tradition, is not great; tradition it self in such matters being very slippery; and often one tradition crossing another.

3. The most eminent qualifications of Saint *Peter*, (such as we before described) might procure to him this advantage.

They might breed in him an honest confidence, pushing him forward on all occasions to assume the former place, and thence by custom to possess it; for *qui sibi fidet, Dux regit examen* — it being in all action, as in walking, where he that naturally is most vigorous and active doth go before the rest. Hor. Ep. 1. 19.

They might induce others to a voluntary concession thereof; for to those, who indisputably do excel in good qualities or abilities, honest and meek Persons easily will yield precedence, especially on occasions of publick concernment; wherein it is expedient, that the best qualified persons should be first seen.

*Αὐτοὶ προσκύουσιν αὐτῷ, &c.* Chryl. in  
Acts 2. 14.  
They yield unto him, &c.

They probably might also move our Lord himself to settle, or at least to insinuate this order; assigning the first place to him, whom he knew most willing to serve him, and most able to lead on the rest in his service.

It is indeed observable, that upon all occasions our Lord signified a particular respect to him, before the rest of his Collegues; for to him more frequently than to any of them he directed his discourse; unto him, by a kind of anticipation he granted or promised those gifts and privileges, which he meant to confer on them all; Him he did assume as Spectator and Witness of his glorious Transfiguration; Him he picked out as Companion and Attendant on him in his grievous Agony; His Feet he first washed; to him he did first discover himself after his Resurrection (as Saint *Paul* implieth;) and with him then he did entertain most discourse; in especial manner recommending to him the Pastoral care of the Church; by which manner of proceeding our Lord may seem to have constituted Saint *Peter* the first in order among the Apostles, or sufficiently to have hinted his mind for their direction, admonishing them by his example to render unto him a special deference.

Matt. 16.  
16.  
Matt. 17. 1.  
Matt. 26.  
37.  
John 13. 6.  
1 Cor. 15.  
5.  
John 21.

4. The Fathers commonly do attribute his priority to the merit of his Faith and Confession, wherein he did outstrip his Brethren. He obtained supereminent glory by the confession of his blessed faith, faith St. *Hilary*. Because he alone of all the rest professeth his love, Joh. 21. therefore he is preferred above all, faith St. *Ambrase*.

Hil. in Mat. Can. 14. p. 566.  
Supereminentem beatæ fidei suæ confessione gloriam promeruit. Hil. de Trin. lib. 6. p. 121.  
Ideo quia solus proficitur amorem suum (John 21.) ex omnibus, omnibus antefertur. Ambr. in Luc. cap. ult.

5. Constantly in all the Catalogues of the Apostles Saint *Peter's* name is set in the front; and when actions are reported, in which he was concerned jointly with others, he is usually mentioned first, which seemeth not done without careful design, or special reason.

Matt. 10. 2.  
Mar. 3. 17.  
Luk. 6. 14.  
Acts 1. 13.  
Joh. 21. 2.

Upon such grounds it may be reasonable to allow Saint *Peter* a primacy of order; such a one as the Ring-leader hath in a Dance, as the primipilar Centurion had in the Legion, or the Prince of the Senate had there, in the *Roman* State; at least, as among Earls, Baronets, &c. and others co-ordinate in degree, yet one hath a precedence of the rest.

VI. As to a Primacy, importing Superiority in power, command, or jurisdiction; this by the *Roman* Party is asserted to Saint *Peter*, but we have great reason to deny it, upon the following considerations.

1. For



1. For such a Power (being of so great importance) it was needful that a Commission from God, its Founder, should be granted in downright and perspicuous terms; that no man concerned in duty grounded

\* It was a reasonable demand, which was made to our Saviour, *Tell us by what authority thou dost these things, or who is he that gave thee this authority?* (Luke 20.2) and the reasonablest of it our Lord did often avow, declaring that if by his doctrine and works he had not vouched the divinity of his authority, it had been no sin to disbelieve or reject him, (John 5. 31, 36. 10. 25, 37. 15. 22, 24.)

*Credo etiam hinc divinorum eloquiorum clarissima auctoritas esset, si homo sine dispendio promissæ salutis ignorare non posset.* Aug. de pec. mer. & rem. 2. 36.

*Nullum fundamentum, aut firmitatem possunt habere, quæ nullis divinarum vocum fulciuntur oraculis.* Lact. 7. 2.

thereon, might have any doubt of it, or excuse for boggling at it; \* it was necessary not only for the Apostles to bind and warrant their Obedience, but also, for us, because it is made the sole foundation of a like duty incumbent on us; which we cannot heartily discharge without being assured of our obligation thereto, by clear revelation, or promulgation of God's will in the Holy Scripture; for it was of old a current, and ever will be a true Rule, which St. Austin in one case thus expresseth, *I do believe that also on this side there would be most clear authority of the Divine Oracles, if a man could not be ignorant of it, without damage of his salvation; and Lactantius thus, Those things can have no foundation, or firmness, which are not sustained by any Oracle of God's word.*

But apparently no such Commission is extant in Scripture; the allegations for it being, as we shall hereafter shew, no-wise clear, nor probably expressive of any such Authority granted by God; but on the contrary divers clearer testimonies are producible derogating from it.

2. If so illustrious an Office was instituted by our Saviour, it is strange that no-where in the Evangelical or Apostolical History (wherein divers acts and passages of smaller moment are recorded) there should be any express mention of that Institution; there being not only much reason for such a report, but many pat occasions for it: The time when Saint Peter was vested with that Authority; the manner and circumstances of his Instalment therein; the nature, rules and limits of such an Office had surely well deserved to have been noted, among other occurrences relating to our Faith and Discipline, by the Holy Evangelists; no one of them, in all probability, could have forborn punctually to relate a matter of so great consequence, as the settlement of a Monarch in God's Church, and a Sovereign of the Apostolical College; (from whom so eminent Authority was to be derived to all posterity, for compliance wherewith the whole Church for ever must be accountable;) particularly it is not credible that Saint Luke should quite slip over so notable a passage, who had (as he telleth us) *attained a perfect understanding of all things, and had undertaken to write in order the things that were surely believed among Christians* in his time, of which things, this, if any, was one of the most considerable.

Luk. 1. 1.

The time of his receiving Institution to such Authority can hardly be assigned. For was it when he was constituted by our Lord an Apostle? Then indeed probably he began to obtain all the primacy and preeminence he ever had; but no such power doth appear then conferred on him, or at any time in our Saviour's life; at least, if it was, it was so covertly and indiscernibly, that both he himself, and all the Apostles must be ignorant thereof, who a little before our Lord's Passion did more than once earnestly contest about Superiority. And it is observable, that whereas our Lord before his Passion did carefully teach and press on the Apostles the chief duties, which they were to observe in their behaviour

Matt. 10. 1.

behaviour towards each other, The maintenance of peace, of charity, of unity, of humility toward one another; yet of paying due respect and obedience to this Superior he said nothing to them.

The collation of that Power could not well be at any time before the celebration of our Lord's Supper, because before that time Saint Peter was scarce an Ecclesiastical Person; at least he was no Priest, as the Convention of *Trent* under a curse doth require us to believe; for it were strange, that an unconsecrated Person, or one who was not so much as a Priest, should be endowed with so much spiritual Power.

*in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos Sacerdotes — anathema sit.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 2.

If any one shall say that in those words, *Do this in remembrance of me*, Christ did not ordain his Apostles Priests — Let him be accursed.

After his Resurrection, our Lord did give divers common Instructions, Orders, and Commissions to his Apostles, but it doth not appear that he did make any peculiar grant to St. Peter; for as to the pretence of such an one drawn out of the *Appendix* to Saint John's Gospel, or grounded on the words *Pasce oves*, we shall afterward declare that to be invalid.

Luke 24. 49. Mark 16. 15.

4. If Saint Peter had been instituted Sovereign of the Apostolical Senate, his Office and State had been in nature and kind very distinct from the common Office of the other Apostles; as the Office of a King from the Office of any Subject; as an ordinary, standing, perpetual, successive Office from one that is only extraordinary, transitory, temporary, personal and incommunicable; (to speak according to distinctions now in use, and applied to this case) whence probably, as it was expedient to be, it would have been signified by some distinct name, or title, characterizing it, and distinguishing it from others; as that of Arch-apostle, Arch-pastour, High-priest, Sovereign Pontife, Pope, his Holiness, the Vicar of Christ, or the like; whereby it might have appeared that there was such an Officer, what the nature of his Office was, what specialty of respect and obedience was due to him: But no such name or title (upon any occasion) was assumed by him, or was by the rest attributed to him, or in History is recorded concerning him; the name of an Apostle being all that he took on him, or by others was given to him.

5. There was indeed no Office above that of an Apostle known to the Apostles, or to the Primitive Church; this (saith St. Chrysostom) was the greatest authority, and the top of authorities; there was (saith he) none before an Apostle, none superiour, none equal to him; this he asserteth of all the Apostles, this he particularly applieth to Saint Paul; this he demonstrateth from Saint Paul himself, who purposely enumerateth the chief Officers instituted by God in his Church, doth place Apostles in the highest rank; Our Lord (\*saith Saint Paul) gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers; and God hath set some in his Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers; πρώτων Ἀποστόλους, why not first a Pope, an Universal Pastor, an Oecumenical Judge, a Vicar of Christ, a Head of the Catho-

Ἀρχὴ μάλιστα. 3 Chryl. Tom. 8.  
κορυφαίαν τὴν ἀρχὴν. p. 114.  
Εἶδες ὁ ἡμετέρος καὶ τὸν Ἀπόστολον,  
καὶ εἶδεναι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄντα, ὅτι ἀνώτερον.  
Ibid.  
Τὸν δὲ Ἀποστόλων ἰσὺς εἶδεναι γέροντα.  
Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 33.  
Ἀντὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἀκούσαντες δευρὸν τὸ  
πρὸς ἀρχάς, καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑψηλοτέρῳ χωρίῳ τῶν  
Ἀποστολικῶν καὶ διδόντων. Chryl. Tom. 8.  
ubi supra.

We have heard Paul himself reckoning up powers or authorities, and placing the Apostolical in the highest place.

\* Eph. 4. 11.

† 1 Cor. 12. 28.

lick Church? Could Saint Paul be so ignorant, could he be so negligent, or so envious, as to pass by, without any distinction, the Supreme Officer, if such a one then had been? As put case, that one should undertake to recite the Officers in any State, or Republick, would he not do strangely if he should pretermitt the King, the Duke, the Consul, the Major thereof? Would not any one, confiding in the skill, diligence and integrity of such a Relator, be induced from such an omission to believe there was no such Officer there? St. Chrysostom therefore did hence very rationally infer, that the Apostolical Office was the Supreme in the Christian state, having no other Superiour to it.

Saint Peter therefore was no more than an Apostle, and as such he could have no command over those, who were in the same highest rank co-ordinate to him; and who as Apostles could not be subject to any.

6. Our Lord himself, at several times, declared against this kind of Primacy, instituting equality among his Apostles, prohibiting them to affect, to seek, to assume or admit a superiority of Power one above another.

Luke 22. There was (saith St. Luke among the twelve, at the participation of  
14. the Holy Supper) a strife among them, who of them should be accounted the  
Luke 22. greatest, or who had the best pretence to Superiority; this strife our  
24. Lord presently did check and quash; but how? not by telling them,  
Τίς αὐτῶν  
δοκεῖ ἡ  
μειζον.  
that he already had decided the case in appointing them a Superiour,  
but rather by assuring them, that he did intend none such to be; that  
he would have no Monarchy, no exercise of any Dominion or authority

by one among them over the rest; but that notwithstanding any advantages one might have before the other, (as \*greater in gifts, or as preceding in any respect) they should be one as another, all humbly condescending to one another, each being ready to yield help and service to one another; The Kings (said he) of the

So doth St. Clemens interpret μείζον, alluding to this place.  
\* Ἦτοι τίς ἡμεῖς, ἢ καὶ δοῦναι γινώσκοντες, ἢ καὶ σφίσι ἐν δακρυαῖς λόγον, ἢ καὶ γρηγορῶς ἐν ἔργοις, τοῦτο μᾶλλον ταπεινοφροσύνῃ δοκεῖν, ὅσα δοκεῖ μᾶλλον μείζον ἢ; καὶ ζῆτιν τὰ κοινὰ πάντων, καὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν. Clem. ad Corinth. I. p. 63. apud Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. p. 466.

Let a man be faithful, let him be powerful in declaring knowledge, let him be wise in discovering reasons, let him be strenuous in works, by so much the more ought he to be humble-minded, by how much the more he seems to be greater than others; and to seek the common benefit of all, and not of himself.

† ὁ μείζον.

|| ὁ ἡγούμενος.

Gentiles exercise Lordship over them; and they that exercise authority over them, are called benefactors, but ye shall not be so; but he that is † greater among you let him be as the younger; and he that is || leader, as he that doth minister; that is, whatever privilege any of you obtaineth, let it not be employed in way of command, but rather of compliance and subserviency, as occasion shall require; let him not pretend to be a Superior, but

rather behave himself as an Inferior: thus our Lord did smother the debate, by removing from among them, whatever greatness any of them did affect or pretend to; forbidding that any of them should, Luke 22. κυχιδεῖν, or ἐξουάζειν, exercise any Dominion or Authority over the rest,  
25, 26. as worldly Princes did over their Subjects.

Again upon another occasion (as the circumstances of the place do imply) when two of the Apostles (of special worth and consideration with our Lord, Saint James and Saint John the Sons of Zebedee) did affect a preeminence over the rest, requesting of our Lord, Grant unto us, Mark 10. that we may sit one on thy right-hand, and the other on thy left-hand in thy  
37. Glory, (or in thy Kingdom, as Saint Matthew hath it, that is, in that new  
Matt. 20. state, which they conceived our Lord was ready to introduce;) which  
25. request doth not seem to import any great matter of Authority; nor probably did they desire so much, as our Adversaries do give to Saint Peter; yet



yet our Lord doth not only reject their sute, but generally declareth, that none of them were capable of such a preferment in his Kingdom; which therein differed from worldly Dominion, because in it there was no room for such an ambition; especially in that state of things, wherein the Apostles were to be placed; which was a state of undergoing Persecutions, not of enjoying Dignity, or exercising Command; all the preferment, which they reasonably could aspire to, being to be dispensed in the future state (whereof they were not aware) according to God's preparation, in correspondence to the patience and industry any of them should exert in God's service (upon which account St. Chrysostom saith, *it was a clear case, that St. Paul should obtain the preference.*

Εὐδελον ὅτι τῆς ἀνατίπτο δόξαν' οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ ἀσκήσις. Chryl. Tom 5. Orat. 33.

It was indeed (as our Lord intimateth) incongruous for those, who had forsaken all things for Christ, who had embraced a condition of disgrace, who were designed by self-denial, humility, neglect of temporal grandeur, wealth and honour; by undergoing persecution, and undertaking conformity to our Lord (*being baptized with the baptism, with which he was baptized*) to propagate the Faith of a Crucified Master; to seek, or take on them authoritative dignity; for among them there could not well be any need of commanding, or being commanded; it was more fit, that all of them should conspire to help and serve one another, in promoting the common design and service of their Lord, with mutual condescension, and compliance; which was the best way of recommending themselves to his acceptance, and obtaining from him answerable reward. Such was the drift of our Lord's discourse; whereunto (as in the other case) he did annex the prohibition of exercising dominion; Ye know (saith he) *that the Princes of nations exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be first among you, let him be your servant*; ὅς ἐστιν δὲ, whoever among you hath a mind to special grandeur and preeminence, let him understand, that there is no other to be attained, beside that which resulteth from the humble performance of charitable Offices to his Brethren: the which whoever shall best discharge, he alone will become greatest and highest in the eye of God.

\* Τότε ἡ ἐπιστολή αὐτῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων. ὅτι ἀρετὴ καὶ ἀσκήσις, ὅτι ἀρετὴ καὶ ἀσκήσις. Chryl. in Acts 1. 26.

Then the Government was not an honour, but a provident care of the governed, &c.

Again at another time, the Apostles dreaming of a secular Kingdom to be erected by our Lord, *disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest*; and for satisfaction presumed to enquire of our Lord about it; when as they surely were very ignorant of Saint Peter's being their head, so there was a fair occasion as could be of our Lord's instructing them in that point, and injoining their duty towards him; but he did not so, but rather taught him together with the rest not to pretend to any such thing, as preferment above the rest; *He sitting down called the twelve, and said unto them; If any one desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all*; how could he (considering the occasion and circumstances of that speech) in plainer terms establish equality, or discountenance any claim to superiority among them? Had Saint Peter then advanced such a plea, as they now affirm of right belonging to him, would he not thereby have depressed and debased himself to the lowest degree?

Mar. 9. 34.  
Luk. 9. 46.  
Matt. 18. 1.

Mar. 9. 35.

Καὶ τοῖς πρὸς πρεσβύταις οἰκονομοῦσι γυναικίμοις μὴ ἀπλότητος ἢ ἰσότητος παρεγγυῶν, λέγων ὡς τὰ παῖδια αὐτοῦ καλεῖσθαι δεῖ. Clem. Alex. Ser. 3. (p. 409.)

And to those familiar friends striving for the preeminence, he commends equality together with simplicity, saying, that they ought to become as little Children.

himself as did that little child (not affecting, or assuming more than such an innocent did) should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven; in real worth, and in the favour of God transcending the rest; so that St. Peter claiming superiority to himself would have forfeited any title to eminency among Christians.

Again, as to the power, which is now ascribed to Saint Peter by the Party of his pretended Successors, we may argue from another place; where our Saviour prohibiting his Disciples to resemble the Jewish Scribes and Pharisees in their ambitious desires and practices, their affectations of preeminence, their assuming places and titles importing difference of rank and authority, He saith, *But be ye not called Rabbi, for there is one Master* (one Guide, or Governour) *of you, even Christ, but ye are Brethren.* How more pregnably could he have declared the nature of his Constitution, and the relation of Christians one to another established therein, to exclude such differences of power? Whereby one doth in way of domination impose his opinion or his will on others.

Matt. 23. 8.  
ὅτι ἓς ἡγεῖται  
γῆτις.

Ye are all fellow-scholars, fellow-servants and fellow-children of God; it therefore doth not become you to be any wise imperious over one another; but all of you humbly and lovingly to conspire in learning and observing the Precepts of your common Lord; the doing which is backed with a Promise, and a Threat suitable to the purpose; *He that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that will abase himself shall be exalted;* the which sentences are to be interpreted according to the intent of the Rules foregoing.

If it be said, that such discourse doth impugn all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; I answer, that indeed thereby is removed all such haughty, and harsh Rule, which some have exercised over Christians; that ἀνδραγαθία, (arbitrary power,) that ἐξουσία ἀνδύθουσα (absolute, uncontrollable authority) that τυραννικὴ πρεσβυμία (tyrannical prerogative) of which the Fathers complain, that κατὰ κλέπας καὶ κλέβων (domineering over their charges) which Saint Peter forbiddeth. We (saith St. Chrysostom) were designed to teach the word, not to exercise empire or absolute sovereignty; we do bear the rank of advisers exhorting to duty.

Greg. Naz. Orat. 28. ἵνα εἰς ἀρχὴν, ὡς εἰς αὐθεντίαν συμβῶμεν τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὡς πατέρες.  
Chryl. in Eph. Orat. 11.

*Ite enim nolentibus praeest, his volentibus.* Hier. Ep. 3. ad Nepot.

Ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαν ἐφελαν ἀρχον, &c.  
Chryl. in Tit. 7.

He ought to rule them so as they may be willing to be ruled, &c.

1 Pet. 5.

*Sed contenti sint honore suo; Patres se sciant esse non dominos* — Hier. Ep. 62. ad Theoph. cap. 3.

A Bishop (saith St. Hierom) differeth from a King, in that a Bishop presideth over those that are willing, the King against their will; (that is, the Bishop's governance should be so gentle and easy, that men hardly can be unwilling to comply with it; but should obey, as Saint Peter exhorteth, ἐκ ἀναγκαστῶς, ἀλλ' ἐκ ὁδοῦ, not by constraint, but of their own accord) and, *Let (saith he) the Bishops be content with their honour; let them know*

know themselves to be Fathers, not Lords; they should be loved, not feared.

And Thou (saith St. Bernard to Pope Eugenius) dost superintend, the name of Bishop signifying to thee not dominion, but duty.

*Amari parens, & episcopus debet, non timeri. Ibid. cap. 1.*

*Indè denique superintendū, sonante tibi Episcopi nomine non dominium, sed officium. Bern. de Consid. 2. 6.*

At least those precepts of our Lord do exclude that power, which is ascribed to Saint Peter over the Apostles themselves, the which indeed is greater, than in likelihood any Pharisee did ever affect; yea in many respects doth exceed any domination which hath been claimed or usurped by the most absolute Monarch upon earth; for the power of Saint Peter, in their opinion was the same, which now the Roman Bishop doth challenge to himself over the Pastors and People of God's Church, by virtue of succession to him; (Saint Peter's power being the base of the Papal, and therefore not narrower than its superstructure; (but what domination comparable to that hath ever been used in the world?

What Emperor did ever pretend to a rule so wide in extent (in regard either to persons, or matters) or so absolute in effect?

Who ever, beside his Holiness, did usurp a command not only over the external actions, but the most inward cogitations of all mankind; subjecting the very minds and consciences of men to his dictates, his laws, his censures?

Who ever thundred Curfes and Damns on all those, who should presume to dissent from his Opinion, or to contest his pleasure?

Who ever claimed more absolute Power, in making, abolishing, suspending Laws, or imposing upon men what he pleased, under obligation of conscience, and upon extremest penalties?

What Prince ever used a style more imperious, than is that which is usual in the Papal Bulls; *Let it be lawful for no man whatever to infringe this expression of our will and command, or to go against it with bold rashness.*

*Nulli hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ voluntatis & mandati infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contra ire.*

What Domitian more commonly did admit the appellation of Lord, than doth the Pope? *our most Holy Lord*, is the ordinary style, attributed to him by the Fathers of Trent, as if they were his slaves, and intended to enslave all Christendom to him.

*Sanctissimus Dominus noster. Concil. Trid. Sess. 22. cap. 11. &c.*

Who ever did exempt his Clients and Dependents in all Nations from subjection to Civil Laws, from undergoing common burthens and taxes, from being judged or punished for their misdemeanors and crimes?

Who ever claimed a power to dispose of all things one way or other, either directly or indirectly? to dispose even of Kingdoms, to judge Sovereign Princes, and to condemn them, to depose them from their authority, absolving their Subjects from all allegiance to them, and exposing their Kingdoms to rapine?

To whom but a Pope were ever ascribed prerogatives like those of judging all men, and himself being liable to no judgment, no account, no reproof or blame; so that (as a Papal Canon assureth us) *let a Pope be si Papa so bad, as by his negligence and male-administration to carry with him innumerable people to Hell, yet no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults; because he being to judge all men is himself to be judged of no man except he be caught swerving from the Faith; which is a case they will hardly suffer a man to suppose possible.*

*si Papa sua, &c. Grat. dist. 40. cap. 6.*

To



To whom but to a Pope was such Power attributed by his followers, and admitted by himself, that he could hear those words applying to him, *All Power is given to thee in Heaven and in Earth?*

Such Power the Popes are wont to challenge, and when occasion serveth do not fail to execute; as Successors of St. Peter; to whom therefore consequently they ascribe it; and sometimes in expresse terms; as in that brave apostrophe of P. Gregory VII. (the Spirit of which Pope hath possessed his Successors generally) *Go to therefore* (said he, directing his Speech to Saint Peter, and Saint Paul) *most Holy*

*Princes of the Apostles, and what I have said confirm by your Authority, that now at length all men may understand, whether ye can bind and loose; that also ye can take away and give on Earth Empires, Kingdoms, and whatever mortal men can have.*

Now if the assuming and exercising such Powers be not that *καταυπερβαίνω*, and *καταξιστάω*, that exalting ones self, that being called Rabbi, Father, Master, which our Lord prohibiteth, what is so? what then can those words signify? what could our Lord mean?

The Authority therefore which they assign to Saint Peter, and assume to themselves from him, is voided by those Declarations and Precepts of our Lord; the which it can hardly be well conceived that our Lord would have proposed, if he had designed to constitute Saint Peter in such a Supremacy over his Disciples and Church.

7. Surveying particulars, we shall not find any peculiar administration committed to Saint Peter, nor any privilege conferred on him, which was not also granted to the other Apostles.

Was Saint Peter an Ambassador, a Steward, a Minister, a Vicar (if you please) or Surrogate of Christ; so were they, by no less immediate and expresse warrant than he; for *As the Father sent me, so also I send you*, said our Lord presently before his departure; by those words (as St. Cyprian remarketh) *granting an equal Power to all the Apostles; and We* (saith St. Paul) *are Ambassadors for Christ; we pray you in Christ's stead be reconciled to God; and, So let a man esteem us as the Ministers of Christ; and Stewards of the Mysteries of God.*

*Et quomodo Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat & dicat, Sicut, &c. Cypr. de Un. Eccl.*

2 Cor. 5. 20.

1 Cor. 4. 1. 2 Cor. 6. 4.

Matt. 16. Was Saint Peter a Rock, on which the Church was to be founded?

18. Be it so; but no less were they all; for the Wall of Jerusalem, which came down from Heaven, had twelve foundations, on which were inscribed the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb; and We (saith Saint Paul) are all built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone; whence Equally (saith St. Hierom) the strength of the Church is settled upon them.

*Ex aequo super eos Ecclesie fortitudo solidatur. Hier. in Jovin. 1. 14.*

1 Pet. 2. 5. Was Saint Peter an Architect of the Spiritual house (as himself called the Church?) so were also they; for I (saith Saint Paul) as a wise Master-builder have laid the Foundation.

1 Cor. 3. 10. Were the Keys of the Church (or of the Kingdom of Heaven) committed to him? So also were they unto them; They had a Power to open and shut it by effectual instruction and persuation, by dispensation of the Sacraments, by exercise of Discipline, by exclusion of scandalous and heretical Persons; Whatever faculty the Keys did import, the Apostles

Apostles did use it in the foundation, guidance and government of the Church; and did (as the Fathers teach) impart it to those, whom they did in their stead constitute to feed and govern the Church.

Had Saint Peter a Power given him of binding and loosing effectually? So had they, immediately granted by our Saviour, in as full manner, and couched in the same terms; *If thou shalt bind on Earth, it shall be bound in Heaven*, said our Lord to him; and *Whatsoever things ye shall bind on Earth, they shall be bound in Heaven*, said the same Divine mouth to them.

ἐκείνους τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν καὶ διαδοχὴν ἐπισκοπῶν ἀξίωμα, ἢ αὐτοὺς περιποιῆσαι τὸ λαμεῖν καὶ λύειν ἐξουσίαν πρὸς τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Phot. Cod. 283. p. 1600.

Those, who by Succession from them (viz. the Apostles,) were endowed with Episcopal Authority, we believe to have the same Power of binding and loosing.

Had he a privilege to remit and retain sins? it was then by virtue of that common grant or promise; *Whose soever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*

Had he power and obligation to feed the Sheep of Christ (all or some?) so had they indefinitely and immediately: so had others by Authority derived from them; who were nominated *Pastors*; who had this charge laid on them: *Take heed unto your selves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood; whom he doth himself exhort, Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof: Let feeding signify what it can, instruction or guidance, or governance, or all of them together (Regio more impera, if you please, as Bellarmine will have it) it did appertain to their charge; to teach was a common duty, to lead and to rule were common functions; Saint Peter could not, nor would not appropriate it to himself; it is his own exhortation, when he taketh most upon him, Be mindful of the commandment (or precept) of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.*

Was his commission universal, or unlimited? so was theirs, by the same immediate Authority; for *All Power* (said he to them, when he gave his last charge) *is given to me in Heaven and in Earth, Go therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I commanded you, and Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

They (as St. Chrysostom speaketh) were all in common intrusted with the whole world, and had the care of all Nations.

Was he furnished with extraordinary gifts, with special graces, with continual directions and assistances for the discharge of the Apostolical Office? so were they; for the promise was common of sending the Holy Spirit, to lead them into all truth, and cloathing them with the power from on high; and of endowing them with Power to perform all sorts of miraculous Works; Our Lord before his departure breathed into them, and said, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; All of them* (saith Saint Luke) *were filled with the Holy Ghost; all of them with confidence and truth could say, It hath seemed God unto the Holy Ghost, and to us; all of them did abundantly partake of that character, which Saint Paul respected, when he did say, The Signs of an Apostle were wrought among you, in signs and wonders, and mighty deeds.*

Did Saint Peter represent the Church as receiving privileges in its behalf; as the Fathers affirm? so did they according to the same Fa-

Cui totius Ecclesie figuram gerenti; Sec. Aug. Ep. 165.

thers;

*Ergo si personam gerebant Ecclesie, & si hoc dictum est, tanquam ipsi Ecclesia diceretur, pax Ecclesie dimittit peccata, &c. Aug. de Bapt. c. Dom. 3. 18.*

thers; If therefore (saith St. Austin, citing the famous place, *sicut me misit Pater*) they did bear the Person of the Church, and this was said to them as if it were said to the Church it self, then the peace of the Church remitteth Sins.

What singular prerogative then can be imagined appertaining to Saint Peter? what substantial advantage could he pretend to beyond the other Apostles? Nothing surely doth appear; whatever the Patrons of his Supremacy do claim for him, is precariously assumed, without any fair colour of proof: he for it is beholding not to any testimony of

*Scimus quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis à Christo recepit aliis Apostolis; nihil enim dictum est ad Petrum, quod aliis etiam dictum non est. Ideo rectè dicimus omnes Apostolos esse aequales cum Petro in potestate. Card. Cus. de Conc. Cath. 2. 1.*

Holy Scripture, but to the invention of Roman fancy: We may well infer with Cardinal Cusanus; We know that Peter did not receive more Power from Christ than the other Apostles; for nothing was said to Peter, which was not also said to the other; Therefore (addeth he) we rightly say, that all the Apostles were equal to Peter in Power.

8. Whereas Saint Peter himself did write two *Catholick Epistles*; there doth not in them appear any intimation, any air or favour of pretence to this Arch-apostolical Power. It is natural for Persons endowed with unquestionable Authority (howsoever otherwise prudent and modest) to discover a spice thereof in the matter, or in the stile of their writing; their Mind conscious of such advantage will suggest an authoritative way of expression; especially when they earnestly exhort, or seriously reprove, in which cases their very Authority is a considerable motive to assent or compliance, and strongly doth impress any other arguments; But no Critick perusing those *Epistles* would smell a Pope in them. The Speech of Saint Peter, although pressing his Doctrine with considerations of this nature, hath no tang of such Authority.

1 Pet. 5. 1. The Elders, (saith he) which are among you, I exhort, who also am an Elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed; by such excellent, but common advantages of his Person and Office he presseth on the Clergy his advices.

Had he been what they make him, he might have said, I the peculiar Vicar of Christ, and Sovereign of the Apostles do not only exhort, but require this of you; this language had been very proper, and no less forcible; but nothing like this, nothing of the Spirit and Majesty of a Pope is seen in his discourse; there is no *pagina nostra voluntatis & mandati*, which now is the Papal stile; when He speaketh highest, it is

† ἐν πολλοῖς. in the common name of the Apostles, Be mindful (saith he) of the command (that is of the Doctrine, and Precepts) of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.

Καὶ ὁ πᾶς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἰσχυρῶς ἐν τοῖς ἐναγγέλοις ὁ Χριστὸς περιπαρῶν, ταύτας εἰς ἔργον ἐνταύθα ὅτι ἰδέν, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰς προφητείας διαλάμπουσιν ὅτι ἀληθείαν. Chryl. in Act. 1.

9. In the Apostolical History, the proper place of exercising this power (wherein, as St. Chrysostom saith, we may see the predictions of Christ, which he uttered in the Gospels, reduced to act, and the truth of them shining in the things themselves) no footstep thereof doth appear.

We cannot there discern, that Saint Peter did assume any extraordinary authority, or that any deference by his Brethren was rendered to him as to their Governour or Judge. No instance there doth occur of his laying commands on any one Apostle, or exercising any act of jurisdiction upon any one; but rather to the contrary divers passages are observable, which argue, that he pretended to no such thing,



thing, and that others did not understand any such thing belonging to him.

His temper indeed and zeal commonly did prompt him to be most forward in speaking and acting upon any emergency for the propagation or maintenance of the Gospel; and the memory of the particular charge which our Lord departing had lately put on him, strongly might instigate him thereto; regard to his special gifts, and sufficiency, did incline the rest willingly to yield that advantage to him; and perhaps because upon the considerations before touched, they did allow some preference in order to him; but in other respects, as to the main administration of things, he is but one among the rest; not taking upon him in his speech or behaviour beyond others. All things are transacted by common agreement, and in the name of all concurring; no appeal in cases of difference is made singly to him, no peremptory decision or decree is made by him; no orders are issued out by him alone, or in a special way; in Ecclesiastical Assemblies he acteth but as one member; in deliberations he doth only propound his opinion, and passeth a single vote; his judgment and practice are sometime questioned, but he is put to render an account of them; he doth not stand upon his Authority, but assigneth reasons to persuade his opinion, and justify his actions; yea sometimes he is moved by the rest, receiving orders and employment from them; these things we may discern by considering the instances which follow.

Behold him doing all things by common consent; nothing authoritatively, nor imperiously. *τα πάντα ᾧ ὡς ἐκ κοινῆς ἐκείνων ἀποστόλων, ὡς ἀρχαῖς.* Chryl. in Act. 1. 16.

In the designation of a new Apostle, to supply the place of Judas, he did indeed suggest the matter and lay the case before them, he first declared his sense; but the whole company did chuse two, and referred the determination of one to lot, or to God's arbitration.

*καὶ ἔστησαν δύο* —

At the institution of Deacons, the twelve did call the multitude of Disciples, and directed them to elect the persons; and the proposal being acceptable to them, it was done accordingly; they chose Stephen, &c. whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.

*Ὁ δὲ λόγος ἐκείνων πνευματικῶν καὶ ἐξελέξατο Στήφην.*

In that important transaction about the observance of Mosaic Institutions, a great stir and debate being started; which Saint Paul and Saint Barnabas by disputation could not appease, what course was then taken? did they appeal to Saint Peter as to the Supreme Dictator and Judge of Controversies? not so; but they sent to the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem to enquire about the question: when those great Messengers were arrived there, they were received by the Church, and the Apostles, and Elders; and having made their report, the Apostles and Elders did assemble to consider about that matter. In this Assembly, after much debate passed, and that many had freely uttered their sense, Saint Peter rose up, with Apostolical gravity, declaring what his reason and experience did suggest conducing to a resolution of the point; whereto his words might indeed be much available, grounded not only upon common reason, but upon special revelation concerning the case; whereupon Saint

G

James,

Act. 15. James, alledging that revelation and backing it with reason drawn  
V. 13 — from Scripture, with much authority pronounceth his judgment:  
V. 14. v. 15.

Διὸ ἐγὼ κείνω. V. 19.  
Τί ὅτι κείνω ἐγὼ; ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' εὐσεβίας  
λέγω ταῦτο ἔδ). Chryf.

Therefore, saith he, *I judge*, (that is, saith St. Chry-  
sostom, *I authoritatively say*) *that we trouble not*

*them, who from among the Gentiles are turned to*

*God; but that we write unto them, &c.* And the

result was, that according to the proposal of Saint James, it was by ge-  
neral consent determined to send a decretal Letter unto the Gentile

Christians, containing a Canon or Advice dire-  
ctive of their practice in the case; *It then seemed*

*good to (or was decreed by) the Apostles and El-*

*ders, with the whole Church, to send—* and the Let-  
ter ran thus, *The Apostles and Elders, and Bre-*

*thren to the Brethren of the Gentiles.* — Now in all this action, (in his

leading precedent for the management of things in Ecclesiastical Synods  
and Consistories) where can the sharpest sight descry any mark of di-  
stinction or preeminence which Saint Peter had in respect to the other

Apostles? did Saint Peter there any-wise behave himself like his preten-  
ded Successors upon such occasions? what authority did he claim or use

before that Assembly, or in it, or after it; did he summon or convo-  
cate it? no, they met upon common agree-  
ment: did he preside there? no, but rather

Saint James, to whom (saith St. Chrysostom) as  
Bishop of Jerusalem the Government was committed:

did he offer to curb or check any man, or to  
restrain him from his liberty of discourse there?

no, *there was much disputation*, every man frankly  
speaking his sense: did he more than use his

freedom of speech becoming an Apostle, in arguing the case, and passing  
his vote? no, for in so exact relation nothing more doth appear: did

he form the definitions, or pronounce the Decree resulting? no, Saint James  
rather did that; for (as an ancient Author saith)

*Peter did make an Oration, but Saint James did enact*

*the Law*: was, beside his suffrage in the debate,

any singular approbation required from him, or did he by any Bill  
confirm the Decrees? no such matter; these were devices of ambition,

creeping on and growing up to the pitch where they now are. In short,  
doth any thing correspondent to Papal pretences appear assumed by

Saint Peter, or deferred to him? If Saint Peter was such a Man as they  
make him, how wanting then was he to himself, how did he neglect

the right and dignity of his Office, in not taking more upon him, upon  
so illustrious an occasion, the greatest he did ever meet with? How de-  
fective also were the Apostolical College, and the whole Church of Je-  
rusalem, in point of duty and decency, yielding no more deference to

their Sovereign, the Vicar of their Lord? Whatever account may be  
framed of these defaultances, the truth is, that Saint Peter then did know

his own place and duty better, than men do know them now; and the  
rest as well understood how it became them to demean themselves;

St. Chrysostom's reflections on those passages are  
very good, that indeed then *there was no fastuous-*

*ness in the Church, and the souls of those primitive*

*Christians were clear of Vanity*; the which dispo-  
sitions did afterward spring up and grow rankly to the great prejudice of

Religion, begetting those exorbitant pretences, which we now disprove.

Again,

Πέτρος διημιουργεῖ, ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος νομο-  
δοτεῖ. Helych apud Phot. Cod. 275.

Οὕτως ἡδὲ πρὸς τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἡ Ἐκκλησία  
ἔτι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνην ἡ ψυχή. Chryf.  
ibid.

Again, when Saint *Peter* being warned from Heaven thereto, did receive *Cornelius*, a Gentile Souldier, unto Communion; divers good Christians, who were ignorant of the warrantableness of that proceeding (as others commonly were, and Saint *Peter* himself was, before he was informed by that special revelation) did not fear to contest with him about it; not having any notion (as it seemeth) of his Supreme unaccountable Authority (not to say of that infallibility, with which the Canonists and Jesuits have invested him) unto whom Saint *Peter* rendreth a fair account, and maketh a satisfactory Apology for his proceedings; not brow-beating those audacious contenders with his Authority, but gently satisfying them with reason. But if he had known his Power to be such, as now they pretend it to be, he should have done well to have asserted it, even out of Good-will and Charity to those good Brethren; correcting their error and checking their misdemeanour; shewing them what an enormous presumption it was so to contend with their Sovereign Pastor and Judge.

N. In the matter at *Antioch* Saint *Peter* did comply with Saint *James*, and the Judaizers, which did not seem such Authority.

Farther, so far was Saint *Peter* from assuming Command over his Brethren, that he was upon occasion ready to obey their Orders; as we may see by that passage, where upon the conversion of divers persons in *Samaria*, it is said, that the Apostles hearing it, did send to them *Peter* and *John*, who going down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. The Apostles sent him, that, had he been their Sovereign, would have been somewhat unseemly and presumptuous; for Subjects are not wont to send their Prince, or Souldiers their Captain; to be sent being a mark of inferiority, as our Lord himself did teach; *A Servant* (said he) *is not greater than his Lord, nor he that is sent greater than he that sent him.* Saint *Luke* therefore should at least have so expressed this passage, that the Apostles might have seemed to keep their distance, and observed good manners: if he had said, they beseeched him to go, that had founded well; but they sent him, is harsh, if he were *Dominus noster Papa*, as the modern Apostles of *Rome* do style their *Peter*. The truth is, then among Christians there was little standing upon Punctilio's, private considerations and pretences to power then took small place; each one was ready to comply with that which the most did approve, the community did take upon it to prescribe unto the greatest persons, as we see again in another instance, where the Brethren at *Antioch* did appoint *Paul* and *Barnabas* (the most considerable persons among them) to go up unto *Jerusalem*. They were then so generous, so merciful, so full of charity, as rather than to cause or foment any disturbance, to recede, or go whither the multitude pleased, and do what was commanded by it.

τίς ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς; τίς ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς; τίς ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς; ἀγάπη; εἰπάτω, εἰ δὲ ἡμεῖς εἰσιν, καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐν ἡμεῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνου, καὶ ποῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ κυρίου. Clem. ad Cor. p. 69.

Who among you is noble and generous? who has bowels of compassion? who is full of charity? Let him say, If for my sake there be sedition, and strife, and divisions, I will depart and go whither you would have me, and do what shall be enjoined me by the multitude.

10. In all relations, which occur in Scripture, about Controversies incident of Doctrine or Practice, there is no appeal made to Saint *Peter's* Judgment, or allegation of it as decisive, no Argument is built on his



Authority; dissent from his Opinion, or disconformity to his Practice, or disobedience to his Orders are not mentioned as ground of reproof, as aggravation of any error, any misdemeanour, any disorder; which were very strange, if then he was admitted or known to be the Universal Prince and Pastor of Christians, or the Supreme Judge and Arbitrator of Controversies among them: for then surely the most clear, compendious and effectual way to confute any error, or check any disorder, had been to alledge the Authority of Saint *Peter* against it; who then could have withstood so mighty a prejudice against his cause? If now a question doth arise about any Point of Doctrine, instantly the Parties (at least one of them, which hopeth to find most favour) hath recourse to the Pope to define it; and his Judgment, with those who admit his pretences, proveth sufficiently decisive, or at least greatly swayeth in prejudice to the opposite Party. If any Heresy, or any Opinion disagreeing from the current sentiments is broached, the Pope presently doth roar, that his voice is heard through Christendom, and thundereth it down; if any Schism or disorder springeth up, you may be sure that *Rome* will instantly meddle to quash it, or to settle matters as best standeth with its Principles and Interests; such influence hath the shadow of Saint *Peter's* Authority now; but no such regard was then had to poor *Pope Peter* himself; he was not so busy and stirring in such cases: the Apostles did not send Hereticks to be knocked down by his Sentence, nor Schismatics to be scourged by his Censure, but were fain to use the long way of Disputation, striving to convince them by Testimonies of Scripture, and rational Discourse. If they did use authority, it was their own; which they challenge as given to them by Christ for edification, or upon account of the more than ordinary gifts and graces of the Divine Spirit, conferred on them by God.

2 Cor. 13.  
10. 10. 8.  
12. 21.

1 Cor. 4. 2.

2 Thes. 3.

14.

1 Cor. 7. 23, 40. 1 Thes. 4. 8.

11. Saint *Peter* no where doth appear intermeddling as a Judge or Governour paramount in such cases; yea where he doth himself deal with Hereticks, and disorderly persons, confuting and reproofing them (as he dealeth with divers notoriously such) he proceedeth not as a Pope decreeing, but as an Apostle warning, arguing, and persuading against them.

It is particularly remarkable how Saint *Paul* reproofing the factions, which were among Christians at *Corinth*, doth represent the several Parties, saying, *I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas, I am of Christ*; Now supposing the case then had been clear and certain (and if it were not so then, how can it be so now?) that Saint *Peter* was Sovereign of the Apostles, is it not wonderful, that any Christian should prefer any Apostle, or any Preacher before him? as if it were now clear and generally acknowledged that the Pope is truly what he pretendeth to be, would any body stand in competition with him, would any glory in a relation to any other Minister before him?

It is observable how St. *Clemens* reflecteth on this contention; *Te were* (saith he) *less culpable for that partiality; for ye did then incline to renowned Apostles, and to a man approved by them; but now, &c.*

Ἄλλ' ὁ  
πρὸς τὸν  
ὅτι ἐκείνῃ  
ἡμεῖς ἀμαρτίαν ὑμῶν περιήνεγκαν  
περιελθόντες ὅς ἑστέ ἀποστόλοι  
μαμαρτυμένοι, καὶ ἀνδρὶ δαδωκεμένῳ παρ' αὐ-  
τοῦ καὶ ὅς, &c. Clem. ad Corinth. p 61.

If it be replied, that *Christ* himself did come into the comparison; I answer that probably no man was so vain, as to compare him with the

the rest, nor indeed could any there pretend to have been baptized by him (which was the ground of the emulation in respect of the others) but those who said they were of *Christ*, were the wise and peaceable sort, who by saying so declined and disavowed faction; whose behaviour Saint *Paul* himself in his discourse commendeth and confirmeth, shewing that all indeed were of *Christ*, the Apostles being only his Ministers to work faith and virtue in them. *None* (saith St. *Austin*) of those contentious persons were good, except those who said, but I am of *Christ*.

We may also here observe, that Saint *Paul* in reflecting upon these contentions had a fair occasion of intimating somewhat concerning Saint *Peter's* Supremacy, and aggravating their blameable fondness, who compared others with him.

12. The consideration of the Apostles proceeding in the conversion of people, in the foundation of Churches, and in administration of their spiritual affairs, will exclude any probability of Saint *Peter's* Jurisdiction over them.

They went about their business not by Order or Licence from St. *Peter*, but according to special instinct and direction of God's Spirit (being sent forth by the Holy Ghost; going by revelation) or according to their ordinary prudence, and the habitual wisdom given unto them; by those aids, (without troubling St. *Peter* or themselves more) they founded Societies, they ordained Pastors, they framed Rules and Orders requisite for the Edification and good Government of Churches, reserving to themselves a kind of paramount inspection and jurisdiction over them; which in effect was only *πατρική ἐπιμέλεια*, a paternal care over them; which they particularly claimed to themselves upon account of spiritual parentage, for that they had begotten them to *Christ*: If (saith St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*) I am not an Apostle to others, I am however so to you? why so? because he had converted them, and could say, As my beloved Sons I warn you, for though ye have ten thousand Instructors in *Christ*, yet ye have not many fathers; for in *Christ* Jesus I have begotten you through the Gospel. This paternal charge they did exercise without any dependence, or regard to Saint *Peter*, none such appearing, it not being mentioned that they did ever consult his pleasure, or render him an account of their proceedings; but it rather being implied in the reports of their actions, that they proceeded absolutely, by virtue of their Universal Office and Commission of our Lord.

If it be alledged that Saint *Paul* went to Jerusalem to Saint *Peter*; I answer that it was to visit him out of respect and love; or to confer with him for mutual edification and comfort; or at most to obtain approbation from him and the other Apostles, which might satisfy some doubters, but not to receive his commands or authoritative instructions from him; it being, as we shall afterwards see, the design of Saint *Paul's* discourse to disavow any such dependence on any man whatever. So doth St. *Chrysostom* note, What (saith he) can be more humble than this Soul? after so many and so great exploits, having no need at all of *Peter*, or of his discourse, but being in dignity equal to him (for I will now say no more) he yet doth go up to him, as to one greater and ancien-

1 Cor. 3. 5.

Falsum est quod illi boni erant, exceptis eis qui dicebant, Ego autem Christi. Aug. co ut. Crescon. l. 27.

Ἐκτιμώμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου.

Act. 13. 4. 2. 16. 6. 9.

Gal. 2. 2. καὶ ἀποκάλυψιν.

2 Pet. 3. 5.

1 Cor. 7. 17. 11. 34. 16. 1.

Tit. 1. 3.

Id. Pel.

1 Thes. 2.

7. 11.

1 Cor. 9. 3.

Act. 18. 1.

1 Cor. 4.

14. 15.

Gal. 4. 19.

Gal. 1. 13.

ισχυρισμῶν.

Τί ταύτης ταπεινοφροσύνης γένοιτ' ἂν τῆς ψυχῆς; μὴ τοιαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα κατορθώματα μὴδὲν Πέτρον δόξαζον, μὴδὲ τῆς ἐκείνου φανῆς, ἀλλ' ἰσχυρισμῶν αὐτοῦ (πλέον γὰρ ἔδεν ἰσχυρισμῶν) ὅπως ἀνέρχεται ὡς σὺν μέλῳ, καὶ πρεσβύτερον καὶ τῆς ἀποδημίας αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκείνῃ γίνεσθαι αἰτίας ἢ ἰσχυρία Πέ-

ter;

τῆς μόνῃ. — ἔχ' ὡς μαθησόμενος τι παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἕδ' ὡς διόρδοσιν πᾶσι Νεκροῖς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τοῦ μόνον, ὡς ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ τιμήσαι τὴν παρουσία. Chryl. in Gal. 1. 18.

ter; and a sight alone of Peter is the cause of his journey thither. — And He went (saith he again) not to learn any thing of him, nor to receive any correction from him, but for this only, that he might see him, and honour him with his presence.

And indeed that there was no such deference of the Apostles to Saint Peter, we may hence reasonably presume, because it would then have been not only impertinent and needless, but inconvenient and troublesome. For,

13. If we consider the nature of the Apostolical Office, the state of things at that time, and the manner of Saint Peter's Life; in correspondence to those things, he will appear incapable, or unfit to manage such a jurisdiction over the Apostles as they assign him.

The nature of the Apostolical Ministry was such, that the Apostles were not fixed in one place of residence, but were continually moving about the World, or *in procinctu*, ready in their gears to move whither Divine suggestions did call them, or fair occasion did invite them, for the propagation or furtherance of the Gospel.

2 Cor. 11.

25.

Ἐπειδὴν

ᾧ ἡμεῶν

ὁ οἰκιστής

τοῦ καὶ ὁποῦντο ἀναβέβαιος, ἐκ ἑστέ συμπεπληγμένοι καὶ λοιποὶ ἀλλήλοις ἢ ᾧ ἂν μὲν τὸ τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ γέγονε ζῆλος.

Chryl. in John 21. 23.

For seeing they were to take upon them the inspection and superintendency of all the World, it behoved them not any longer to be mixt or conjoyned together, for this had been a great loss and hinderance to the World.

1 Cor. 4. 9.

2 Cor. 4. 8.

6. 4. 11. 25.

Matt. 24. 9.

Luke 21.

12.

The state of things was not favourable to the Apostles, who were discountenanced and disgraced, persecuted, and driven from one place to another; (as our Lord foretold of them) Christians lay scattered about at distant places, so that opportunities of dispatch for conveyance of instructions from him, or of accounts to him were not easily found.

Euseb. 3. 1. Niceph. 2. 38, 39, 40. Tertul. ad Jud. cap. 7.

\* Ο ὁ οἰκιστὴς καθόλου, καὶ τῶν πᾶσι πᾶσι δὲ καὶ ὁποῦντο ἀναβέβαιος, ἐκ ἑστέ συμπεπληγμένοι καὶ λοιποὶ ἀλλήλοις ἢ ᾧ ἂν μὲν τὸ τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ γέγονε ζῆλος.

Baf. Seleuc. Or. 2. He that run his race through the whole Universe, and by his so eager running for the Faith made the World as it were too narrow for him.

Col. 1. 6. 23. Rom. 10. 18.

considering the manner of his Life, which was not settled in any one known place, but movable and uncertain; for he continually roved over the wide World, preaching the Gospel, converting, confirming and comforting Christian People, as occasion starting up did induce; how then could he conveniently dispense all about his ruling and judging influence? how in cases incident could direction be fetched from him, or reference be made to him by those subordinate Governors, who could not easily know where to come at him, or whence to hear from him in any competent time? To send to him had been to shoot at rovers; affairs therefore which should depend on his resolution and orders, must have had great stops; he could but very lamely have executed such an office; so that his jurisdiction must have been rather an extreme inconvenience and encumbrance, than any-wise beneficial or useful to the Church.

Gold and Silver he had none, or a very small Purse to maintain Dependents and Officers to help him; (Nuncio's, Legates à latere, Secretaries, Auditors, &c.) Infinity of affairs would have oppressed a poor helpless man; and to bear such a burthen as they lay on him no one could be sufficient.



14. It was indeed most requisite, that every Apostle should have a complete, absolute, independent Authority in managing the concerns and duties of his Office; that he might not any-wise be obstructed in the discharge of them; not clogged with a need to consult others, not hampered with orders from those who were at distance, and could not well descry what was fit in every place to be done.

The direction of him who had promised to be *perpetually present with them*, and by his Holy Spirit to guide, to instruct, to admonish them upon all occasion, was abundantly sufficient; they did not want any other conduct or aid beside that special Light and powerful Influence of Grace, which they received from him; the which *ἰκανώσαν αὐτοὺς*, did (as Saint Paul speaketh) render them sufficient Ministers of the New Testament. Matt. 28.  
20.  
Joh. 16. 13.  
14. 26.  
2 Cor. 3. 5.  
Rom. 15.  
15.

Accordingly their discourse and practice do thoroughly favour of such an independence; nor in them is there any appearance of that being true, which Bellarmine dictateth, that the Apostles depended on Saint Peter, as on their head, and commander.

— à quo illi tanquam à capite, & imperatore suo pendeabant. Bellarm. de Pont. 1. 16.

15. Particularly the discourse and behaviour of Saint Paul towards Saint Peter doth evidence, that he did not acknowledge any dependence on him, any subjection to him.

Saint Paul doth often purposely assert to himself an independent and absolute power, inferiour or subordinate to none other, insisting thereon for the enforcement or necessary defence of his Doctrine and Practice; (*I have become a fool in glorying, ye have compelled me*, (saith he) alledging divers pregnant arguments to prove and confirm it, drawn from the manner of his call, the characters and warrants of his Office, the tenour of his proceedings in the discharge of it, the success of his endeavours, the approbation and demeanour toward him of other Apostles. 2 Cor. 12.  
11.  
Rom. 11.  
13.

As for his call and commission to the Apostolical Office, he maintaineth (as if he meant designedly to exclude those pretences, that other Apostles were only called *in partem sollicitudinis* with Saint Peter) that he was an Apostle not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father; that is, that he derived not his Office immediately or mediately from men, or by the ministry of any man; but immediately had received the grant and charge thereof from our Lord; as indeed the History plainly sheweth, in which our Lord telleth him, that he did *Constitute him an Officer, and a chosen instrument to him, to bear his name to the Gentiles*. Bell. 1. 9.  
14. 16.  
Οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐν' αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς χριστός. Gal. 1. 1.

Προχρηλούμαι οὐ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, &c. Act. 9. 15. 22. 21.

Hence he so often is careful and cautious to express himself an Apostle by the will and special grace, or favour and appointment, and command of God; and particularly telleth the Romans, that by Christ he had received grace, and Apostleship.

Θεληματὶ θεοῦ. 1 Cor. 1. 1. 2 Cor. 1. 1. Eph. 1. 1. Col. 1. 1. 2 Tim. 1. 1. Χάριτι. 1 Cor. 15. 10. Eph. 3. 7. 1 Tim. 1. 12. 2 Tim. 1. 12. Κατ' ἐμπράξιν. 1 Tim. 1. 1. Rom. 1. 5.

For the warrant of his Office, he doth not alledge the allowance of Saint Peter, or any other, but those special gifts and graces which were conspicuous in him, and exerted in miraculous performances; Truly, saith he, the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds; and I will not dare to speak of any of those things, which Christ hath not wrought by me to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God. 2 Cor. 12.  
12.  
Rom. 15.  
18, 19.  
1 Cor. 2. 4.

To

To the same purpose he alledgeth his successful industry in converting men to the Gospel; *Am I not an Apostle?* (saith he) *are ye not my work in the Lord? If I am not an Apostle to others, I am surely one to you; for the seal of mine Apostleship are ye in the Lord.* And, *By the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was on me became not in vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all.*

In the discharge of his Office, he immediately (after that he had received his call and charge from our Saviour) without consulting or taking licence from any man, did vigorously apply himself to the work, *Immediately, saith he, I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them, that before me were Apostles, so little did he take upon himself to be accountable to any man.*

In settling order, and correcting irregularities in the Church, he professed to act merely by his own Authority, conferred on him by our Lord; *Therefore (saith he) being absent I write these things, that being present I may not use severity, according to the authority which the Lord hath given me for edification, not for destruction.*

Such being the privileges, which he did assert to himself with all confidence, he did not receive for it any check from other Apostles, but the chief of them, *knowing the grace that was given unto him, gave unto him the right-hand of fellowship; in token of their acknowledgment and allowance of his proceedings.*

Upon these considerations (plainly signifying his absolute independence in the reception and execution of his Office,) he doth more than once affirm (and in a manner boast) himself *to be inferior in nothing to the very chief Apostles*; in nothing, that is in nothing pertinent to the Authority, or substantial Dignity of his place; for as to his personal merit he professeth himself *much less than the least of the Apostles*, but as to the authentickness and authority of his Office he deemed himself equal to the greatest; *being by the grace of God what he was; a Minister of the Gospel, according to the gift of the grace of God, which was given him according to the effectual working of his power.*

When he said he was *behind none*, he could not forget Saint Peter; when he said *none of the chief*, he could not but especially mean him (he did indeed, as St. Chrysostom saith, intend to compare himself with St. Peter;) when he said *in nothing*, he could not but design that which was most considerable, the Authority of his place; which in the context he did expressly mention. For when he objected to himself the semblance of fondness or arrogance in speaking after that manner, he declared that he did not speak rashly or vainly, but upon serious consideration, and with full assurance, finding it very needful or useful to maintain his Authority, or to *magnify his Office*, as he elsewhere speaketh.

If things had been, as now we are taught from the Roman School, it is strange, that Saint Paul should compare himself so generally, not excepting Saint Peter; that he should express (nor by the least touch intimate) no special consideration for his, as they tell us, *ordinary Pastor*; that he should not consider how liable such words were to be interpreted in derogation to Saint Peter's due Prerogatives.

But it is no wonder, that Saint Paul, in Saint Peter's absence, should thus stand on his own legs, not seeming to mind him, whenas in immediate transactions with him he demeaned himself as his fellow, yielding to him no respect or deference as to his Superior. For,

When Saint Paul went to Jerusalem to have conference with Saint Peter, and other Apostles, who were chief in repute, he professeth, that they

1 Cor. 9.

1 —

1 Cor. 15.

10.

2 Cor. 11.

23.

Gal. 1. 16.

17.

2 Cor. 13.

16. 10. 8.

Gal. 2. 9.

2 Cor. 12.

16. 17.

2 Cor. 12.

11. 11. 5.

1 Cor. 15.

9.

Eph. 3. 8.

1 Cor. 15.

10.

Eph. 3. 7.

Περὶ τοῦ

καὶ Πέτρου

πολιτείας

τῆς πόλεως

αὐτῆς.

2 Cor. 11.

5.

Κατὰ τὴν

ἀποδοκίμωσιν.

2 Cor. 12.

11. 1. 16.

17.

Rom. 11.

13.

Bell. de

Pont. 1.

11.

they did not confer any thing to him, so as to change his opinion, or divert him from his ordinary course of practice, which was different from theirs; this was (it seemeth) hardly proper or seemly for him to say, if Saint Peter had been his Sovereign; but he seemeth to say it on very purpose, to exclude any any prejudice that might arise to his Doctrine from their authority or repute; their authority being none over him, their repute being impertinent to the case; for *whatsoever* Gal 2.6. (addeth he) *they were, it maketh no matter to me, God respecteth no man's person*; the which might well be said of Persons greater in common esteem, but not so well of one was his Superior in Office; to whose opinion and conduct, as of his Judge and Pastor by God's appointment, he did owe a special regard.

Again, St. Paul at Antioch observing St. Peter out of fear and policy to act otherwise than became the simplicity and sincerity of Christians, to the prejudice of Evangelical Truth, Charity and Liberty, against his own judgment and former practice, drawing others by his pattern into the same unwarrantable course of behaviour, did withstand him to the face, did openly reprove him before all, because he was blamable, did as P. Gelasius I. affirmeth (to excuse another Pope misbehaving himself) *worthily confute him*; did (as St. Augustine often doth affirm and urge, in proof that greatest Persons may sometimes err and fail,) *correct him, rebuke him, chide him.*

(Vid. P. Pelag. II. apud Bin. Tom. 4. p. 308. in Epist. ad Eliam.)

V. 11. 14.

Nunquid ideo aut illa ejus sequenda sunt, quæ merito ejus Co apostolus ejus facta redarguit. Gelas. I. de Anath. (apud Bin. Tom. 3. p. 645.)

et, & corrigente, Aug. c. Crescon, 1. 32. 2. 32. Ep. 19. de Bapt. c. Don. 2. 1. 2. correptus cont. Don. 3. 1. objurgavit. Ep. 8.

— qui de minore causa conversationis ambigua Petro ipsi non pepercit. Tert. 5. 3. (contra Marc.)

— who for a smaller matter of doubtful conversation spared not Peter himself.

Cum laudetur etiam Pauli minimi Apostolorum sana ratio atque libertas, quod Petrum Apostolorum primum adductum in hypocrisin, & non rectâ viâ incidentem ad veritatem Evangelii fidenter improban, in faciem illi resistit, eumque coram omnibus coram objurgavit. Fac. Her. 8. 6.

Whereas the sound reason and freedom even of Paul the least of the Apostles, is commended, in that, when Peter the chief of the Apostles was carried away with dissimulation, and walked not in a right way, according to the truth of the Gospel, he boldly dissid'd, and withstood him to the face, and reprov'd him openly before all.

Which behaviour of Saint Paul doth not well consist with the Supposition, That Saint Peter was his superior in Office; if that had been, Porphyrius with good colour of reason might have objected *procacity* to Saint Paul in taxing his betters; for he then indeed had shewed us no commendable pattern of demeanour towards our Governors, in so boldly opposing Saint Peter, in so openly censuring him, in so smartly confuting him.

Hier. ad Aug. Ep. 11. in Proh. ad Gal.

More unseemly also it had been to report the business as he doth in writing to the Galatians; for to divulge the miscarriages of Superiors, to revive the memory of them, to register them, and transmit them down to all posterity, to set forth our clashing and contests with them, is hardly allowable; if it may consist with justice and honesty, it doth yet little favour of gravity and modesty: It would have been more seemly for Saint Paul to have privately and humbly remonstrated to Saint Peter, than openly and down-rightly to have reprehended him; at least it would have become him in cold blood to have represented his carriage more respectfully, consulting the honour of the Universal Pastor, whose reputation was like to suffer by such a representation of his proceedings. Pope Pelagius II. would have taught Saint Paul better manners; who saith, that *they are not to be approved, but reprobated, who do reprove or accuse their Prelates*; and Pope Gregory

Non sunt consentiendi, sed reprobandi, qui prelatos suos reprehendunt vel accusant. Pelag. II. Ep. 2.

H

would



*Bonis subditis sic praepositum suorum, mala displicent, ut tamen hoc ab aliis occultent.* Greg. M. Moral. 25. 15.

*Admonendi sunt subditi, ne praepositorum suorum vitam temere judicent; siquid eos fortasse agere reprehensibiliter vident.* Ec. Greg. Past. part. 3. cap. 1. Admon. 5.

would have taught him another lesson, namely, that the evils of their Superiors do so displease good Subjects, that however they do conceal them from others; and Subjects are to be admonished, that they do not rashly judge the life of their Superiors, if perhaps they see them do blamably, &c.

It is plain, that Saint Paul was more bold with Saint Peter, than any man now must be with the Pope; for let the Pope commit never so great crimes, yet no mortal (saith the Canon Law) presume to reprove his faults.

But if Saint Peter were not in Office superior to Saint Paul, but his Colleague, and equal in Authority, although preceeding him in standing, repute, and other advantages; then Saint Paul's free proceeding toward him was not only warrantable, but wholesom, and deserving for edification to be recited and recorded; as implying an example how Colleagues upon occasion should with freedom and sincerity admonish their Brethren of their errors and faults; Saint Peter's carriage in patiently bearing that correction also affording another good pattern of

*Nam nec Petrus, quem primum Dominus elegit, Ec. Cyprian. Ep. 71. (ad Quint.)*

*† Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. 2. 2.*

equanimity in such cases; to which purpose \* St. Cyprian (alledged and approved by † St. Austin) doth apply this passage; for (saith he)

neither Peter whom the Lord first chose, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul afterward contested with him about circumcision, did insolently challenge, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself, so as to say that he did hold the primacy, and that rather those who were newer and later Apostles ought to obey him, neither despised he Saint Paul, because he was before a persecutor of the Church, but he admitted the counsel of truth, and easily consented to the lawful course, which Saint Paul did maintain; yielding indeed to us a document both of concord and patience, that we should not pertinaciously love our own things, but should rather take those things for ours which sometimes are profitably and wholesomely suggested by our Brethren and Colleagues, if they are true and lawful; this St. Cyprian speaketh, upon supposition that Saint Peter and Saint Paul were equals, or (as he calleth them) Colleagues and Brethren, in rank co-ordinate; otherwise St. Cyprian would not have approved the action; for he often severely doth inveigh against Inferiors taking upon them to censure their Superiors;

*Quis enim hic est superbia tumor, quae arrogantia animi, quae mentis inflatio ad cognitionem suorum praepositos & Sacerdotes vocare? Cyprian. Ep. 69.*

What tumour (saith he) of pride, what arrogance of mind, what inflation of heart, is it to call our Superiors and Bishops to our cognisance? St. Cyprian therefore could not conceive Saint Peter to be

Saint Paul's Governor, or Superior in Power; he doth indeed plainly enough in the forecited words signify that in his Judgment Saint Peter had done insolently and arrogantly, if he had assumed any obedience from Saint Paul. St. Austin also doth in several places of his Writings make the like application of this passage.

The ancient Writer contemporary to St. Ambrose, and passing under his name, doth argue in this manner; Who dared resist Peter the first Apostle, to whom the Lord did give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, but another such a one; who in assurance of his election knowing himself to be not unequal to him, might constantly disprove what he had unadvisedly done?

*Nam quis eius claves regni caelorum Dominus dedit, resistere, nisi alius talis, qui fiducia electionis suae, sciens se non imparē, constanter improbare: quod illa sine consilio fecerat? Ambrosius in Gal. 2. 9.*

*Paulus Petrum reprehendit, quod non auderet, nisi se non imparē sciret. (Hieronymus vel alius ad Gal. citatur a Grat. Caus. 2. qu. 7. cap. 33.)*

Paul reprehended Peter, which he would not have dared to do, had he not known himself to be equal to him.

It

It is indeed well known, that *Origen*, and after him *St. Chrysostom* and *St. Hierom*, and divers of the Ancients beside, did conceive that *Saint Paul* did not seriously oppose or tax *Saint Peter*, but did only do it seemingly, upon confederacy with him, for promoting a good design.

*S. Cyril. c. Jul. lib. 9. (p. 323.)*  
*Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 59. καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν*  
*Aug. Ep. 11.*

This interpretation, however strained and earnestly impugned by *Saint Austin*, I will not discuss; but only shall observe, that it being admitted doth rather strengthen than weaken our discourse: for, if *Saint Peter* were *Saint Paul's* Governor, it maketh *Saint Peter* to have consented to an act in all appearance indecent, irregular, and scandalous; and how can we imagine, that *Saint Peter* would have conspired to the impairing his own just Authority in the eye of a great Church? doth not such a condescension imply in him a disavowing of Superiority over *Saint Paul*, or a conspiracy with him to overthrow good Order?

To which purpose we may observe, that *St. Chrysostom*, in a large and very elaborate discourse, wherein he professeth to endeavour an aggravation of the irregularity of *Saint Paul's* demeanour, if it were serious; doth not lay the stress of that aggravation upon *Saint Paul's* opposing his lawful Governor; but his only so treating a *Co-apostle* of such eminency: neither when to that end he designeth to reckon all the advantages of *Saint Peter* beyond *Saint Paul*, or any other Apostle, doth he mention this, which was chiefly material to his purpose, that he was *Saint Paul's* Governour; which observations if we do carefully weigh, we can hardly imagine, that *St. Chrysostom* had any notion of *Saint Peter's* Supremacy in relation to the Apostles.

*Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 59. Καὶ ὅ αὖτις ἡ*  
*κατηρέν, καὶ μὴ οὐκ αὖτις, &c.*

ὅτι ἐάν μοι ἐρεῖται ἂν Πέτρος ἢ κατη-  
ρέν ἀποκρίσασθαι, ὁ Παῦλος οἶνε  
δαρμονίως, καὶ ἀπεικονίως τῷ Συναπο-  
στόλῳ κατηρέν —

So that 'tis no advantage to me, if, when *Peter* has confuted the charge, *Paul* appear to accuse his Fellow-Apostle boldly and inconsiderately.

In fine, the drift of *Saint Paul*, in reporting those passages concerning himself, was not to disparage the other Apostles, nor merely to commend himself, but to fence the truth of his Doctrine, and maintain the liberty of his Disciples against any prejudice that might arise from any authority, that might be pretended in any considerable respects superior to his, and alledged against them; to which purpose he declareth by arguments and matters of fact, that his Authority was perfectly Apostolical, and equal to the greatest; even to that of *Saint Peter* the prime Apostle, of *Saint John* the beloved Disciple, of *Saint James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem*; the judgment or practice of whom, was no law to him, nor should be to them, farther than it did consist with that Doctrine, which he by an independent Authority, and by special revelation from *Christ* did preach unto them: He might (as *St. Chry-* Gal. 1. 12.  
*stom* noteth) have pretended to some advantage over them, in regard that he had laboured more abundantly than they all; but he forbeareth to do so, being contented to obtain equal advantages.

Καὶ ταῦτα πάντα τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ πλεονεκτήματα, θεωρεῖται ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐκτίσας, οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ πῶς ἐκλασκαλεῖται τὸ τοῦ ἀγαπᾶ τοῦ Ἰσα φέρων. *Chryl. in Gal. 1. 1.*

Well therefore, considering the disadvantage with this passage bringeth to the *Roman* pretence might this History be called by *Baronius*, a *Baron. An.*  
*History hard to be understood, a stone of offence, a rock of scandal, a rugged* 51. 532.  
*place, which Saint Austin himself, under favour, could not pass over without* 34. 35. &c.  
*stumbling.*

Ro. 11. 13. It may also be considered, that Saint Paul particularly doth assert to himself an independent authority over the Gentiles, co-ordinate to that which Saint Peter had over the Jews; the which might engage him so earnestly to contest with Saint Peter, as by his practice seducing those, who belonged to his charge; the which also probably moved him thus to assert his authority to the Galatians, as being Gentiles under his care, and thence ob-

Gal. 1. 6, 7. liged especially to regard his authority. They (saith Saint Paul) knowing that I was entrusted with the Gospel of uncircumcision, as Peter was entrusted with that of circumcision, — gave unto me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; the which words do clearly enough signify, that he took himself, and that the other Apostles took him to have under Christ an absolute charge, subordinate to no man, over the Gentiles; whence he claimeth to himself, as the burthen, the care of all the Churches; he therefore might well contest for their liberty, he might well insist upon his authority among them.

Τὸς μὲν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐπέτελε τὸ Πέτρον, τοῖς δὲ Ἕλλησι δὲ Παῦλον ἐπέστησεν ὁ Χρῆστος. Chryl. T. 5. Or. 39.

Δείκνυσιν αὐτοῖς ὁμοτιμίαν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοις ἰσότητος, ἀλλὰ τὸ κορυφαίον συγκαίεται. Δεῖκνυσι ὅτι ὁ αὐτοῖς ἴσας ἐπέτασσεν ἀξίας. Chryl. in Gal. 2. 8.

Thus did St. Chrysostom understand the case; for Christ (saith he) committed the Jews to Peter, but set Paul over the Gentiles; and, He (saith that great Father) farther doth shew himself to be equal to them in dignity, and compareth himself not only to the others, but even to the ring-leader; shewing that each did enjoy equal dignity.

It may also by any prudent Considerer easily be discerned, that if Saint Peter had really been as they assert him, so in Authority superior to the other Apostles, it is hardly possible, that Saint Paul should upon these occasions express nothing of it.

16. If Saint Peter had been appointed Sovereign of the Church, it seemeth that it should have been requisite, that he should have outlived all the Apostles; for then either the Church must have wanted a Head, or there must have been an inextricable Controversy about who that Head was. Saint Peter dyed long before Saint John (as all agree) and perhaps before divers other of the Apostles. Now, after his departure, did the Church want a Head? (then it might before, and after have none; and our Adversaries lose the main ground of their pretence) did one of the Apostles become Head? (which of them was it; upon what ground did he assume the Headship, or who conferred it on him; who ever did acknowledge any such thing, or where is there any report about it?) was any other person made Head? (suppose the Bishop of Rome, who only pretendeth thereto;) then did Saint John, and other Apostles become subject to one in degree inferior to them; then what becometh of Saint Paul's first Apostles, secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers? what do all the Apostolical privileges come to, when Saint John must be at the command of Linus, and Cletus, and Clemens, and of I know not who beside? was it not a great absurdity for the Apostles to truckle under the Pastors, and Teachers of Rome?

1 Cor. 12. 28.

Eph. 4. 11.

The like may be said for Saint James, if he (as the Roman Church doth in its Liturgicks suppose) were an Apostle; who in many respects might claim the preeminence. Who therefore in the Apostolical Constitutions is preferred before Clement Bishop of Rome.

17. Upon the same grounds, on which a Supremacy of power is claimed to Saint Peter, other Apostles might also challenge a Superiority therein



therein over their Brethren; but to suppose such a difference of power among the rest is absonous; and therefore the grounds are not valid, upon which Saint *Peter's* Supremacy is built.

I instance in Saint *James* and Saint *John*, who upon the same probabilities had (after Saint *Peter*) a preferenc to the other Apostles. For to them our Saviour declared a special regard; to them the Apostles afterwards may seem to have yielded a particular deference; they, in merit and performances seem to have surpassed; they, (after Saint *Peter* and his Brother) were first called to the Apostolical Office; they (as Saint *Peter*) were by our Lord new Christened (as it were) and nominated *Boanerges*, by a name signifying the efficacy of their endeavour in their Master's service; they, together with Saint *Peter*, were assumed to behold the transfiguration; they were culled out to wait on our Lord in his agony; they also, with Saint *Peter* (others being excluded) were taken to attest our Lord's performance of that great Miracle, of restoring the Ruler's Daughter to life; they, presuming on their special favour with our Lord, did pretend to the chief places in his Kingdom.

To one of them it is expressed that our Saviour did bear a peculiar affection, he being *the Disciple whom Jesus loved*, and *who leaned on his bosom*; to the other he particularly discovered himself after his Resurrection, and first honoured him with the Crown of Martyrdom.

They in blood and cognation did nearest touch our Lord; being his Cousin Germans; (which was esteemed by the Ancients a ground of preferment;) as *Hegeſippus* reporteth.

Ἦ Ἑκαταπύρι, οὗ ἀντὶ τῆς μαρτυρίας οὗ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ οὗτος τῷ Κυρίῳ. *Hegeſipp. apud Euseb. 3. 20.* They being dismissed and sent away to govern the Churches, as being both Witnesses, and also Kinsmen of our Lord.

Their industry and activity in propagation of the Gospel was most eminently conspicuous.

To them it was peculiar, that Saint *James* did first Suffer for it, and Saint *John* did longest persist in the faithful Confession of it; whose Writings in several kinds do remain as the richest magazines of Christian Doctrine, furnishing us with the fullest Testimonies concerning the Divinity of our Lord, with special Histories of his Life, and with his divinest Discourses; with most lively incitements to Piety and Charity; with prophetic Revelations concerning the state of the Church. He therefore was one of the *σύλαιοι*, chief Pillars and Props of the Christian Profession, one of the *ὑπερλίαν Ἀπόστολοι*, the *Superlative Apostles*.

Accordingly in the Rolls of the Apostles, and in reports concerning them, their names usually are placed after Saint *Peter*.

Hence also some of the Fathers do take them, as Saint *Peter* was, to have been preferred by our Lord\*; *Peter* (saith Saint *Gregory Nazianzen*) and *James* and *John*, who both were indeed, and were reckoned before the others—so indeed did Christ himself prefer them; and *Peter*, *James* and *John*, (saith *Clement Alex.*) did not as being preferred by the Lord himself, but as being preferred by the Lord himself, *Ruffinus* reads, Bishop of the Apostles.)

Ἦ τὸν ἑκαταπύριον; ὅτι οὗτοι τῶν ἄλλων ἦσαν ὑπερλίαν. *Chryl. id.* Wherefore taketh he these only with him? because these were the chief and principal above the others.

Πέτρος, καὶ Ἰακώβος, καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ αὐτοὶ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ ὡς καὶ ἀειδόμενοι—οὕτως καὶ ἡ Χριστοῦ ἀποστολή. *Greg. Naz. Or. 26.*

Πέτρον φησὶ καὶ Ἰακώβον, καὶ Ἰωάννην ὡς ἀντὶ τὸν ὅτι καὶ οὗτοι ἀποστολικὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀείνοντες, ἀλλὰ Ἰακώβον καὶ δὲ καὶ ὡς ἀποστολικὸν ἱεροσολυμίᾳ ἀπέσταλται. (*Ruffinus reddit Apostolorum Episcopum.*) *Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. 2. 1.*

Hence

Hence if by designation of *Christ*, by the Concession of the Apostolical College, by the prefulgency of his excellent worth and merit, or upon any other ground Saint *Peter* had the *πρωτεια* or first place, the *δευτερα* or next place in the same kind, by like means, upon the same grounds seem to have belonged unto them; and if their advantage did imply difference not in Power but in Order only (not authoritative Superiority, but honorary Precedence) then can no more be allowed or concluded due to him.

18. The Fathers both in express terms, and implicitly or by consequence, do assert the Apostles to have been equal or co-ordinate in Power and Authority.

What can be more express, than that of St. *Cyprian*. The other Apostles were indeed that which Peter was, endowed with equal consorship of honour and power; and again, Although our Lord giveth to all the Apostles after his resurrection an equal power, and saith, As the Father sent me, so I send you.

Hoc erant utiq; & ceteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consorsio pradiis & honoris & potestatis.

quomodo Apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat, ac dicat, &c. Cyp. de Un. Eccl.

Δεχνύς,  
ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ  
ἐκκλῆσι  
ἀπὸ λαοῦν ἀξία.

What can be more plain than that of St. *Chrysostom*, Saint Paul sheweth, that each Apostle did enjoy equal dignity?

Chryf. in Gal. 2. 8.

Chryf. in  
Gal. 1. 8.

How again could St. *Chrysostom* more clearly signify his Opinion, than when comparing Saint *Paul* to Saint *Peter*, he calleth Saint *Paul* ἰσότημον αὐτοῦ, equal in honour to him, adding, πλεον γὰρ εἰδὼν ἐρῶ τίως, for I will not as yet say any thing more, as if he thought Saint *Paul* indeed the more honourable?

Vide Tert.  
de Præscr.  
cap. 20.

Πῶς καὶ  
Ἰωάννης ἰ-  
σότημοι  
ἀλλήλοις,  
καθὼς καὶ  
Ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἅγιοι μαθηταί.

How also could Saint *Cyril* more plainly declare his sense to be the same, than when he called Saint *Peter* and Saint *John* ἰσότημοις ἀλλήλοις, equal to one another in honour?

As were also the Apostles, and holy Disciples.

Did Tertullian think Saint *Paul* inferior to Saint *Peter*, when he said, It is well that Peter is even in martyrdom equalled to Paul? Bene quod Petrus Paulo & in martyrio adequatur. Tert. de Præscr. 24.

At dicis  
super Pe-  
trum fun-  
datur Ec-  
clesia, li-  
cēt id ipsum alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesia fortitudo solidetur.

Did not St. *Hierom* also sufficiently declare his mind in the case, when he saith of the Apostles, that the strength of the Church is equally settled upon them.

But you will say, the Church is founded upon Peter, though the same thing in another place is affirmed of all the Apostles, and that &c.

Ὁ ὁ μα-  
θητὸν κο-  
ρυφαίῳ,  
καὶ τῷ δευ-  
τέρῳ αὐτῷ καὶ ἰσότημοις ἀλλήλοις.

Doth not *Dionysius* (the supposed *Areopagite*) call the Decad of the Apostles co-ordinate with their Foreman, Saint *Peter*? in conformity, I suppose, to the current judgment of his Age.

Dionys. de Eccl. Hier. cap. 5.

Ceteri  
Apostoli  
cum Petro  
par con-  
sortium  
honoris  
& pote-  
statis acceperunt, qui etiam in toto orbe dispersi Evangelium predicaverunt, quibusq; decedentibus successerunt Episcopi, qui sunt constituti per totum mundum in sedibus Apostolorum.

What can be more full than that of *Isidore*, (whose words shew how long this sense continued in the Church) The other Apostles did receive an equal share of honour and power; who also being dispersed in the whole world did preach the Gospel; and to whom departing the Bishops did succeed, who are constituted through the whole world in the Sees of the Apostles.

Isid. Hisp. de Off. 2. 5.

By consequence the Fathers do assert this equality, when they affirm (as we before did shew) the Apostolical Office to be absolutely Supreme;

preme; when also they affirm (as afterwards we shall shew) all the Apostles Successors to be equal as such; and particularly that the Roman Bishop upon account of his succeeding Saint Peter hath no preeminence above his Brethren? for, *wherever a Bishop be, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium, at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, at Alexandria, or at Thavis, he is of the same worth, and of the same Priesthood: the force of five Eugubians, and lowness of poverty, doth not render a Bishop more high, or more low; for that all of them are Successors of the Apostles.*

19. Neither is it to prudential esteem a despicable consideration, that the most ancient of the Fathers, having occasion sometimes largely to discourse of Saint Peter, do not mention any such Prerogatives belonging to him.

20. The last Argument which I shall use against this Primacy, shall be the insufficiency of those Arguments and Testimonies, which they alledge to warrant and prove it.

If this Point be of so great consequence as they make it; if, as they would persuade us, the subsistence, order, unity and peace of the Church, together with the Salvation of Christians, do depend on it; if, as they suppose, many great points of truth do hang on this pin; if it be, as they declare, a main Article of Faith, and not only a simple error, but a pernicious heresy to deny this primacy: then it is requisite that a clear revelation from God should be producible in favour of it (for upon that ground only such points can firmly stand); then it is most probable, that God (to prevent controversies, occasions of doubt, and excuses for error about so grand a matter) would not have failed to have declared it so plainly, as might serve to satisfy any reasonable man, and to convince any froward Gainsayer; but no such revelation doth appear; for the places of Scripture which they alledge do not plainly express it, nor pregnantly imply it, nor can it by fair consequence be inferred from them: No man unprepossessed with affection to their side would descry it in them; without thwarting Saint Peter's Order, and wresting the Scriptures they cannot deduce it from them. This by examining their Allegations will appear.

I. They alledge those words of our Saviour, uttered by him upon occasion of Saint Peter's confessing him to be the Son of God, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church*; here, say they, Saint Peter is declared the Foundation, that is, the sole Supreme Governor of the Church.

*constitutis ceteris Ecclesiis prelatas est, sed Evangelicâ voce Domini & saluatoris nostri primum ob-*  
*tinuit; Tu es Petrus (inquiens) &c. P. Gelaf. 1. dist. 21. cap. 3.*

The Holy Church of Rome is not prefer'd before other Churches by any Synodical Decrees, but has obtain'd the primacy by the voice of our Lord and Saviour in the Gospel, saying, *Thou art Peter, &c.*

To this I answer.

1. Those words do not clearly signify any thing to their purpose; for they are metaphorical, and thence ambiguous or capable of divers interpretations; whence they cannot suffice to ground so main a point of Doctrine, or to warrant so huge a Pretence; these ought to stand upon down-right, evident and indubitable Testimony.

It is pretty to observe how Bellarmine proposeth this Testimony; Of which words (saith he) the sense is plain and obvious, that it be understood, that under two metaphors the principate of the whole Church was promised; as

*Quorum verborum planus & obviu-  
sus est, ut intelligatur sub duabus metap-  
horis promissum Petro totius Ecclesiæ prin-  
cipatum. Bell. de Pont. 1. 10.*

if

*Agitur de summa vtri Christiana, &c.  
Bell. pref. ad lib. de Pontif. R.*

*Est etiam revera non simplex error, sed  
perniciosa heresis negare B. Petri prima-  
tum à Christo institutum. Bell. de Pont.  
R. 1. 10.*

*Ubiq;  
fuerit E-  
piscopus,  
five Roma  
five Eugu-  
bia, &c.  
Hier. ad  
Evagr.  
Ep. 85.  
Clem. ad  
Corinth.  
Iren. 3. 12.  
3. 1, 3.*

*2 Pet. 3.  
16.*

*18.  
S. Romana  
Ecclesiæ  
nullis Sy-  
nodicis*



if that sense could be so plain and obvious, which is couched under two metaphors, and those not very pat or clear in application to their sense.

2. This is manifestly confirmed from that the Fathers and Divines both ancient and modern have much differed in exposition of these words.

Tostat. in [Some (saith *Abulensis*) say that this rock is Peter—— others say, and  
Matth. 16. better, that it is Christ—— others say, and yet better, that it is the confes-  
qu. 67. sion which Peter maketh.]

1 Cor. 3. For some interpret this rock to be Christ himself, of whom Saint Paul  
11. saith, Other foundation can no man lay, than that which is laid, which is Je-  
sus Christ.

Scio me St. *Austin* telleth us in his *Retractions*, that he often had expounded  
postea se- the words to this purpose, although he did not absolutely reject that  
pissime interpretation which made Saint Peter the rock; leaving it to the Rea-  
exposuisse, der's choice which is the most probable.  
ut super  
hanc Pe-

tram intelligeretur quem confessus est Petrus; harum autem duarum sententiarum qua sit probabilior eligat  
Lectlor. Aug. Retr. 1. 21. Vide Aug. in Joh. tr. 124. de verb. Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13.

Super hanc, inquit, Petram quam confessus es, edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Aug. in Joh. tr. 124. S. de verb.  
Dom. in Matt. Serm. 13. (Tom. 10.)

Super hanc Petram, id est, super me edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Anl. in Matt. 16. 18.

Others (and those most eminent Fathers) do take the rock to be

τῇ Πέτρᾳ — τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ σίμῃ τῆς ὁμο-  
λογίας. Chryl. in Matt. 16. 18.

— ἢ Ἐκκλησίαν ἔρησεν ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμο-  
λογίᾳ οἰκοδομήσεν ἢ ἐκείνη. Chryl. in  
Joh. 1. 30.

Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρᾳ, ἢ ἐπὶ τῇ τῷ  
Πέτρῳ ὥτε γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ πρ. ἀπὸ δὲ  
τῇ πίστιν τῇ ταύτῃ Ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομήσεν.  
Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 163.

Super hanc igitur confessionis Petram  
Ecclesia edificatio est. Hil. de Trin. 6.

— Ἀποστόλων τῶ πρώτου, ἢ τῶ ὁμολο-  
γίαν ὅτι ἵνα κηρύξῃ, καὶ διὰ τὸν τῆς Ἐκ-  
κλησίας κατήχησιν. Συντάξις τοῦ ἁγίου.  
Theod. Ep. 77.

Πέτρα γὰρ πᾶς ὁ Χριστὸς μαρτυρῶν, &c.  
Orig. in Matt. 16. p. 275.

In vera fide persistite, & vitam vestram  
in Petra Ecclesia, hoc est in confessione  
B. Petri Apostolorum Principis solidate. Greg. M. Ep. 3. 33. Persist in the true Faith; and establish and fix  
your life upon the rock of the Church, that is, upon the confession of Blessed Peter the Prince of the Apostles.

Super ista confessione edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Felix III. Ep. 5. Vide Nic. I. Ep. 2. 6. Joh. VIII. Ep. 76.

Unus pro omnibus loquens, & Ecclesia  
voce respondens. Cyr. Ep. 55.

One speaking for all, and answering in  
the name of the Church.

Cui Ecclesie figuram gerenti Dominus  
ait. Super hanc— Aug. Ep. 165.

To whom, representing the whole  
Church, our Lord saith, Upon this rock, &c.

Petrus ex persona omnium Apostolo-  
rum proficitur. Hier. in loc. Peter pro-  
fesses in the person of all the Apostles.

Saint Peter's faith, or profession; Upon the Rock  
(saith the Prince of interpreters) that is upon  
the faith of his profession; and again, Christ said  
that he would build his Church on Peter's confession;  
and, again (he or another ancient Writer un-  
der his name) upon this rock, he said not upon Pe-  
ter, for he did not build his Church upon the man,  
but upon his faith.

Our Lord (saith Theodoret) did permit the first  
of the Apostles, whose confession he did fix as a prop  
or foundation of the Church, to be shaken.

[Whence Origen saith, that every disciple of  
Christ is the rock, in virtue of his agreement  
with Peter in that holy confession.]

This sense even Popes have embraced.

Others say, that as Saint Peter did not speak  
for himself, but in the name of all the Apostles,  
and of all faithful people, representing the Pa-  
stors and people of the Church; so correspon-  
dently our Lord did declare, that he would  
build his Church upon such faithful Pastors and  
Confessors.

Others do indeed by the rock understand Saint Peter's person, but  
do not thereby expound to be meant his being Supreme Governor of  
the Apostles, or of the whole Church.

Vide Ri- The Divines, Schoolmen and Canonists of the Roman Communion  
galt. in do not also agree in exposition of the words; and divers of the most  
Cyp. Ep. learned  
27. 40. 70.  
71. 73. 69.

learned among them do approve the interpretation of St. Chrysostom.

Now then how can so great a Point of Doctrine be firmly grounded on a place of so doubtful interpretation? how can any one be obliged to understand the words according to their interpretation which Persons of so good sense, and so great Authority do understand otherwise? with what modesty can they pretend that meaning to be clear, which so perspicacious eyes could not discern therein? why may not I excusably agree with St. Chrysostom, or St. Austin, in understanding the place? may I not reasonably oppose their judgment to the Opinion of any Modern Doctors, deeming Bellarmine as fallible in his conceptions, as one of them; why consequently may I not without blame refuse their Doctrine as built upon this place, or disavow the goodness of this proof?

3. It is very evident that the Apostles themselves did not understand those words of our Lord to signify any grant or promise to Saint Peter of Supremacy over them; for would they have contended for the chief place, if they had understood whose it of right was by our Lord's own positive determination? would they have disputed about a question, which to their knowledge by their Master was already stated? would they have troubled our Lord to inquire of him who should be the greatest in his Kingdom, when they knew that our Lord had declared his will to make Saint Peter Viceroy? would the Sons of Zebedee have been so foolish and presumptuous as to beg the place, which they knew by our Lord's word and promise fixed on Saint Peter? would Saint Peter among the rest have fretted at that idle overture, whenas he knew the place by our Lord's immutable purpose and infallible declaration assured to him? And if none of the Apostles did understand the words to imply this Roman sense, who can be obliged so to understand them? yea who can wisely, who can safely so understand them? for surely they had common sense, as well as any man living now; they had as much advantage as we can have to know our Lord's meaning; their ignorance therefore of this sense being so apparent, is not only a just excuse for not admitting this interpretation, but a strong bar against it.

Matth. 20. 21. Ἀνέστωτες οἱ δέκα ἡ-  
γάρκτες.  
And when the ten heard it, they were  
moved with indignation.

4. This interpretation also doth not well consist with our Lord's answers to the contests, inquiries, and petitions of his Disciples concerning the point of Superiority: for doth he not (if the Roman expositions be good) seem upon those occasions not only to dissemble his own word and promise, but to disavow them or thwart them? can we conceive, that he would in such a case of doubt forbear to resolve them, clearly to instruct them, and admonish them of their Duty?

5. Taking the Rock as they would have it to be the Person of Saint Peter, and that on him the Church should be built, yet do not the words being a Rock probably denote Government; for what resemblance is there between being a Rock and a Governor; at least what assurance can there be that this metaphor precisely doth import that sense; seeing in other respects, upon as fair similitudes, he might be called so?

St. Austin saith, the Apostles were Foundations, because their Authority doth support our weakness.

Quare sunt fundamenta Apostoli &  
Prophetae, quia eorum auctoritas portat  
infirmitatem nostram. Aug. in Pf 86.

In illis erant fundamenta, ibi primum posita est fides Ecclesie: Hier. in Pf. 86.

Πέτρος ὁ ὡς λίθος ὃς ἐπὶ αὐτῷ ἡ μακαρία Πέτρος ἐκδομασται, διὰ τὸ παλῶς ἐνεργήσας τῇ πίσει, καὶ στεφῶς καὶ ἐνεργήσας ἔχεν αὐτὸς τὰς ἐκ πειρασμῶν ἐναρμόνίας πλῆρας. Bas. in II. 2. p. 869.

Petrus à Petra nomen adeptus est, quia primus meruit Ecclesiam fidei firmitate fundare. Chryf. Serm. 53.

These are fair explications of the metaphor, without any reference to Saint Peter's Government.

But however also admitting this, that being such a Rock doth imply Government and Pastoral Charge; yet do they (notwithstanding these grants and suppositions) effect nothing; for they cannot prove the words spoken exclusively in regard to other Apostles, or to import any thing singular to him above or beside them: He might be a governing Rock, so might others be; the Church might be built on him, so it might be on other Apostles; he might be designed a Governor, a great Governor, a principal Governor, so might they also be; this might be without any violence done to those words.

And this indeed was; for all the other Apostles in Holy Scripture are called Foundations, and the Church is said to be built on them.

Εἰ δὲ εἴη ὁ ἅνα ἐκείνον Πέτρος νομίζεις ὡς τὸν θεὸν οἰκοδομῆσαι τὴν πᾶσαν Ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τί εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀπελὶ Ἰωάννη τοῦ τὸ βροντῆς υἱοῦ, ἢ ἑκαστοῦ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, &c. Orig. in Matth. 16. p. 275.

Eph. 2. 20.

Petra Christus est, qui donavit Apostolis, ut ipsi quoque Petre vocentur. Hier. in Amos 9. 12.

Dicis super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat. Hier. in Jovin. 1. 14.

The twelve Apostles (saith another ancient Author) were the immutable Pillars of orthodoxie, the Rock of the Church.

Ἐκκλησία — ἐκκλησία ἐστὶ τὸ συνέλευσις τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ Προφητῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει ᾧ καὶ Πέτρος, ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ Πέτρος ἐκδομασται ὁ κύριος οἰκοδομησέναι τὴν πᾶσαν Ἐκκλησίαν. Basil. in Isa. 2. p. 869.

Cypr. Ep. 71, 73. St. Cyprian in his disputes with Pope Stephen did more than once allege this place, yet, could he not take them in their sense to signify exclusively; for he did not acknowledge any imparity of Power among the Apostles or their Successors. He indeed plainly took these words to respect all the Apostles and their Successors, our Lord taking occasion to promise that to one, which he intended to impart to all for themselves and their Successors; Our Lord (saith he)

Dominus noster Episcopi honorem, & Ecclesia sue rationem disponens, dicis Petro, Ego tibi dico — Inde per temporum & successionum vices Episcoporum ordinatio, & Ecclesia ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constitatur, & omnis actus Ecclesie per eosdem prepositos gubernetur. Cypr. Ep. 27. & de Unir. Eccl.

conceive the Church to be built not on the Pope singularly, but on all

St. Hierom faith, that they were Foundations, because the Faith of the Church was first laid in them.

St. Basil faith, that Saint Peter's Soul was called the Rock, because it was firmly rooted in the Faith, and did hold stiff without giving way against the blows of temptation.

Chrysologus faith, that Peter had his name from a Rock, because he first merited to found the Church by firmness of Faith.

If (saith Origen, the Father of Interpreters) you think the whole Church to be only built on Peter alone, what will you say of John the Son of thunder, and of each of the Apostles? &c. largely to this purpose.

Christ (as St. Hierom faith) was the Rock, and he bestowed on the Apostles, that they should be called Rocks. And You say (saith he again) that the Church is founded on Peter, but the same in another place is done upon all the Apostles.

The Church (saith St. Basil) is built upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Peter also was one of the Mountains; upon which Rock the Lord did promise to build his Church.

ordering the honour of a Bishop, and the order of his Church, saith to Peter, I say to thee, &c. hence through the turns of times and successions, the ordination of Bishops, and the manner of the Church doth run on, that the Church should be settled upon the Bishops, and every Act of the Church should be governed by the same Prelates: as therefore he did



all the Bishops; so he thought our Lord did intend to build his Church not upon Saint Peter only, but on all his Apostles.

6. It is not said, that the Apostles, or the Apostolical Office should be built on him; for that could not be, seeing the Apostles were constituted, and the Apostolical Office was founded before that promise; the words only therefore can import, that according to some meaning he was a Rock, upon which the Church, afterward to be collected, should be built; he was *A Rock of the Church to be built*, as *Tertullian* speaketh; the words therefore cannot signify any thing available to their purpose, in relation to the Apostles.

*Latuit aliquid Petrum edificande Ecclesie Petram dictum. Tertul. de Præfer. cap. 22.*

7. If we take Saint Peter himself for the Rock, then (as I take it) the best meaning of the words doth import, that our Lord designed Saint Peter for a prime Instrument, (the first Mover, the most diligent, and active at the beginning, the most constant, stiff and firm) in the support of his Truth, and propagation of his Doctrine, or conversion of men to the belief of the Gospel; the which is called building of the Church; according to that of *St. Ambrose*, or some ancient *Homilist* under his name, *He is called a Rock, because he first did lay in the Nations the Foundations of Faith*: In which regard as the other Apostles are called Foundations of the Church, (the Church being founded on their labours,) so might Saint Peter signally be so called; who (as *St. Basil* saith, allusively interpreting our Saviour's words) *for the excellency of his Faith did take on him the edifying of the Church*.

Πέτρος ἐν Ἀποστόλοις πρῶτος ἐκκλησίαν Χριστοῦ. Chryl.  
Peter first of all the Apostles preaches Christ.

*Petra dicitur eo quod primus in nationibus fidei fundamenta posuerit. Ambr. de Sanctis. Serm. 2.*

Ὁ διὰ πίστεως ἡρώδης ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δεξιόμηνος. Bas. contra Eunom. lib. 2.  
*Petra edificande Ecclesie. Tertul. de præf. c. 22.*

Both he and they also might be so termed, for that upon their testimonies concerning the Life, Death and Resurrection of Christ, the Faith of Christians was grounded; as also it stands upon their convincing discourses, their holy practice, their miraculous performances, in all which Saint Peter was most eminent; and in the beginning of Christianity displayed them to the edification of the Church.

This interpretation plainly doth agree with matter of fact and history; which is the best interpreter of right or privilege in such cases; for we may reasonably understand our Saviour to have promised that, which in effect we see performed, *so the event sheweth, the Church was built on him, that is by him; saith Tertullian.*

*Sic enim exitus docet, in ipso Ecclesia extructa est, id est per ipsum, &c. Tert. de pudic. cap. 21.*

But this sense doth not imply any Superiority of Power, or Dignity granted to Saint Peter above his Brethren; however it may signify an advantage belonging to him, and deserving especial respect; as *St. Chrysostom* notably doth set out in these words; *Although John, although James, although Paul, although any other whoever may appear performing great matters; he yet doth surpass them all, who did precede them in liberty of speech, and opened the entrance, and gave to them as to a river carried with a huge stream to enter with great ease*: Doing this, as, I say, it might signify his being a Rock of the Church, so it denoteth an excellency of merit, but not a Superiority in Power.

Καὶ Ἰωάννης, καὶ Ἰάκωβος, καὶ Παῦλος καὶ ἄλλοι ὅσοι μὲν πάντα μέγα πρᾶγμα ποιῶν φαίνονται, ἀπάντων οὗτος πλεονεκτεῖ, ὁ προεργασίας αὐτῶν τῇ παρήσει, καὶ διανοίξας τὴν εἰσόδον, καὶ δὲς αὐτοῖς καθεύοντι ποταμῷ πολλῷ φερόμενῳ ῥέματι μὲν πολλῆς ἀδείας ἐπεσευδέν, &c. Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 19.

8. It may also be observed, that Saint *Peter* before the speaking of those Words by our Lord may seem to have had a Primacy, intimated Matt. 10. 2. by the Evangelists, when they report his call to the Apostolical Office; John 6. 69. and by his behaviour, when in this confession, and before in the like,

*Loci non immemor sui primatum egit; — primatum Confessionis, non honoris; Fidei, non ordinis. Ambr. de Incarn. cap. 4.*

he undertook to be their mouth and Spokesman; when *not being unmindful of his place* (saith St. *Ambrose*) he did act a Primacy; a Primacy (addeth that Father) of Confession, not of honour; of Faith, not of order; his Primacy therefore (such as he had) cannot well be founded on this place, he being afore possessed of it, and (as St. *Ambrose* conceived) exercising it at that time.

II. They alledge the next words of our Lord, spoken in sequel upon the same occasion, *To thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is, say they, the Supreme power over all the Church; for he (say they) that hath the Keys is Master of the House.

*Per claves datas Petro intelligimus summam potestatem in omnem Ecclesiam. Bell. de Pont. 1. 3.*

To this testimony we may apply divers of the same answers, which were given to the former; for,

1. These words are figurate, and therefore not clear enough to prove their assertion.

2. They do admit and had received various interpretations.

3. It is evident, that the Apostles themselves did not understand these words as importing a Supremacy over them, that Saint *Peter* himself did not apprehend this sense, that our Lord upon occasion inviting to it did not take notice of his promise, according thereto.

4. The words, *I will give thee*, cannot any-wise be assured to [have been exclusive of others, or appropriated to him. He said (as a very learned man of the Roman Communion noteth) to *Peter*, *I will give thee the Keys*, but he said not, *I will give them to thee alone*;

*Dixit Petro, dabo tibi claves, at non dixit, dabo tibi soli. Rigalt. in Epist. Firmil.*

nothing therefore can be concluded from them to their purpose.

5. The Fathers do affirm, that all the Apostles did receive the same Keys.

*Ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ Πέτρου μόνον εἶδον ὑπὸ τῶ Κυρίου αἱ κλεῖδες τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ ἡδὲς ἔτερος τῶ μακαρίου αὐτῶς λέγει; καὶ τὸ κοινὸν ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς ἑτέροις, τὸ δὲ οὐκ οὐκ αὐτῶς τῆς βασιλείας τῶ ἑστέων, πῶς καὶ ἡ πάντα τὰ ἐκτελεσθῆναι, καὶ τὰ ἐκτελεσθῆναι ὡς αὐτοῖς Πέτρου λαλεσθῆναι; Orig. in Matt. 16 p. 275.*

Are (saith *Origen*) the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given by the Lord to *Peter* alone, and shall none other of the Blessed ones receive them? but if this, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, be common, how also are not all the things common, which were spoken before, or are added as spoken to *Peter*.

St. *Hierom* says in expresse words, that all the Apostles did receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

*Quod Petro dicitur, Apostoli dicuntur.*

*Ambr. in Plal. 38.*

*What is said to Peter, is said to the Apostles.*

*Licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, & cunctis claves regni caelorum accipiant. Hier. in*

*Jov. 1. 14.*

Though the same thing in another place is done upon all the Apostles, and all receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

*Claves regni caelorum communicandas ceteris solis solus accepit. Opt. lib. 7.*

*Communicandas ceteris dixit, quas ipse Christus communicaturus erat ceteris. Rigalt in Cyp. de Un. Eccl.*

He (saith *Optatus*) did alone receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven (which were) to be communicated to the rest; that is (as *Rigaltius* well poundeth those words) which Christ himself would also communicate to the rest.

Theophy-

Theophylact. *Although it be spoken to Peter alone, I will give thee, yet it is given to all the Apostles.*

It is part of Saint John's character in St. Chrysostom, *He that hath the Keys of the Heavens.*

6. Indeed whatever (according to any tolerable exposition, or according to the current expositions of the *Fathers*) those Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven do import (whether it be a faculty of opening it by Doctrine, of admitting into it by dispensation of Baptism, and absolution, of excluding from it by Ecclesiastical censure, or any such faculty signified by the metaphorical expression) it plainly did belong to all the Apostles, and was effectually conferred on them; yea after them upon all the Pastors of the Church in their several precincts and degrees; who in all Ages have claimed to themselves the power of the Keys; to be (as the Council of Compeign calleth all Bishops) *clavigeri*, the Key-bearers of the Kingdom of Heaven.

So that in these words nothing singular was promised or granted to Saint Peter; although it well may be deemed a singular mark of favour, that what our Lord did intend to bestow on all Pastors, that he did anticipately promise to him; or, as the *Fathers* say, to the Church and its Pastors in him. In which respect we may admit those words of Pope Leo I.

*alias vis istius potestatis, sed non frustra uni commendatur quod omnibus intinetur. Petro ergo singulariter hoc creditur, quia cunctis Ecclesie rectoribus Petri forma proponitur. Leo I. in Nar. Petri & Pauli. Serm. 2.*

The efficacy of this Power passed indeed upon all the Apostles; yet was it not in vain, that what was intimated to all, was commended to one. Therefore this is committed singly to Peter, because Peter's pattern and example is propounded to all the Governors of the Church.

7. Indeed divers of the *Fathers* do conceive the words spoken to Saint Peter not as a single person, but as a representative of the Church, or as standing in the room of each Pastor therein; unto whom our Lord designed to impart the power of the Keys.

*All we Bishops (saith St. Ambrose) have in Saint Peter received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

*celorum cuncti suscepimus sacerdotes. Ambr. de dign. Sac. 1. Ecclesia quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni celorum accepit, id est, potestatem ligandi solvendi; peccata. Aug. tract. 124. in Joh. vide tract. 50.*

The Church which is founded upon Christ, received from him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, i. e. the power of binding and loosing sins.

*In typominitatis Petro Dominus dedit potestatem. Aug. de Bap. 3. 17.*

Our Lord gave the power to Peter, as a type of Unity.

*Εν τρισωκω ος κορυφαυς η τοις λοιποις τ μωδων η τωαυτη ενωσια ηδωται. Phot. Cod. 180.*

Such Authority was given to the rest of the Apostles in the person of him who was the chief.

*Non sine causa inter omnes Apostolos Ecclesie Catholice personas justinet Petrus; huic enim Ecclesie claves regni celorum date sunt, cum Petro date sunt. Aug. de Ag. Chr. cap. 30 in Pl. 108.*

Not without cause does Peter among the rest of the Apostles sustain the Person of the Catholic Church; for to this Church are the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven given, when they are given unto Peter.

8. These answers are confirmed by the words immediately adjoined \*equivalent to these, and interpretative of them, *And whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven* — the which do import a power or privilege soon after expressly, and in the very same words promised or granted to all the Apostles; as also the same power in other words was by our Lord conferred on them all after the Resurrection.

If therefore the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven do import supreme Power, then each Apostle had Supreme Power.

9. If

*Ει ος ης περς Πιδον μωον ειεν τδ δδωται, αλλα ης πασι τοις Αποστολοις ηδωται. Theoph. in loc.*

*Ο τας κλες ηδων τς ερωων. Chryf. in pref. Evang. Joh.*

*Episcopi — quos constat esse vicarios Christi, & clavigeros regni celorum. Conc. Comp. apud Bin. Tom. 6. p. 361.*

*Transivit quidem in Apostolos*

*stro claves regni*

*\*Aug. supr. Matt. 18. 18.*

*Joh. 20. 23.*



9. If we should grant ( that which no-wise can be proved, ) that something peculiarly belonging to Saint *Peter* is implied in those words, it can only be this, that he should be a prime man in the work of preaching and propagating the Gospel, and conveying the heavenly

*Sic enim exitus docet, in ipso Ecclesia extructa est, id est, per ipsum; ipse clavem imbuisset; vide quam, Viri Israelitæ auribus mandate quæ dico, Jesum Nazarenum virum à Deo vobis destinatum, &c. Ipse denique primus in Christi baptismo resecravit aditum cælestis regni, &c. Tert. de pud. 21.*

benefits of it to Believers; which is an opening of the Kingdom of Heaven; according to what *Tertullian* excellently saith of him; So (saith he) *the event teacheth, the Church was built in him, that is, by him; he did initiate the Key; see which, Temen of Israel, hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, &c. He, in fine,*

*in the baptism of Christ did unlock the entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.*

10. It seemeth absurd, that Saint *Peter* should exercise the power of the Keys in respect to the Apostles: for did he open the Kingdom of Heaven to them, who were by our Lord long before admitted into it? —

11. In fine, our Lord ( as Saint *Luke* relateth it ) did say to Saint *Peter*, and probably to him first, *Fear not from henceforth thou shalt catch men*; might it hence be inferred, that Saint *Peter* had a peculiar or sole faculty of catching men? why might it not by as good a consequence, as this, whereby they would appropriate to him this opening faculty? Many such instances might in like manner be used.

III. They produce those words of our Saviour to Saint *Peter*, *Feed my sheep*, that is, in the Roman interpretation, *Be thou Universal Governor of my Church*.

To this allegation I answer.

1. From words which truly and properly might have been said to any other Apostle, yea to any Christian Pastor whatever, nothing can be concluded to their purpose, importing a peculiar duty, or singular privilege of Saint *Peter*.

2. From indefinite words a definite conclusion (especially in matters of this Kind) may not be inferred; it is said, *do thou feed my Sheep*, it is not said do thou alone feed all my Sheep; this is their arbitrary gloss, or presumptuous improvement of the Text; without succour whereof the words signify nothing to their purpose, so far are they from sufficiently assuring so vast a pretence: for instance, when Saint *Paul* doth exhort the Bishops at *Ephesus* to feed the Church of God, may it thence be collected, that each of them was an Universal Governor of the whole

Church, which Christ had purchased with his own blood?

Act. 20.  
28.

3. By these words no new power is (assuredly at least) granted or

instituted by our Lord; for the Apostles before this had their Warrant and Authority consigned to them, when our Lord did inspire them, and solemnly commisionate them, saying, *As the Father did send me, so I send you*; to which Commission, these words, (spoken occasionally, before a few of the Disciples) did not add or derogate. At most the words do only (as St. *Cyril* saith) *renew the former Grant of Apostleship*, after his great offence of denying our Lord.

4. These words do not seem institutive or collative of Power, but rather only admonitive or exhortative to duty; implying no more, but the pressing a common duty, before incumbent on Saint *Peter*, upon a special

*Καὶ ἐπεστρέψεν αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος λέγων ὅτι σὺ δεῖς ἀποστολεῖν ὅμοι τῶν ἐτέρων μαθητῶν Πέτρος. Cyril in loc.*

Peter was ordained to the holy Apostleship together with the rest of the Disciples.

John 20. 21.

*Διὰ τὸ ὅτι πάντες τὸ κύριον βόσκετε τὰ ἀρνία μου, ἀναγνώστες ὡς ποτε τις τῶν ἡδὺ δοθέντων Ἀποστολῆς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι νοήτω. Cyril ib.*

special occasion, in an advantageous season, that he should effectually discharge the Office, which our Lord had committed to him.

Our Lord (I say) presently before his departure, when his words were like to have a strong impression on Saint Peter, doth earnestly direct and warn him to express that special ardency of affection, which he observed in him, in an answerable care to perform his duty of feeding, that is of instructing, guiding, edifying in faith and obedience those Sheep of his, that is, those Believers, who should be converted to embrace his Religion, as ever he should find opportunity.

5. The same Office certainly did belong to all the Apostles, who (as St. Hierom speaketh) were the Princes of our Discipline, and Chieftains of the Christian Doctrine; they at their first vocation had a commission and command to go unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel; that were scattered abroad like sheep not having a shepherd; they before our Lord's Ascension were enjoined to teach all Nations the Doctrines and Precepts of Christ; to receive them into the fold, to feed them with good instruction, to guide and govern their Converts with good Discipline; Hence All of them (as St. Cyprian faith) were shepherds; but the flock did appear one, which was fed by the Apostles with unanimous agreement.

6. Neither could Saint Peter's charge be more extensive, than was that of the other Apostles; for they had a general and unlimitted care of the whole Church; that is, according to their capacity and opportunity, none being exempted from it, who needed or came into the way of their discharging Pastoral Offices for them.

They were Oecumenical Rulers (as St. Chrysostom faith) appointed by God, who did not receive several Nations or Cities, but all of them in common were entrusted with the world.

Hence particularly St. Chrysostom calleth Saint John, a Pillar of the Churches over the world, and Saint Paul an Apostle of the world; who had the care not of one House, but of Cities and Nations, and of the whole Earth; who undertook the World, and governed the Churches; on whom the whole World did look, and on whose soul the care of all the Churches every where did hang; into whose hands were delivered the Earth, and the Sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the World.

οἰκουμενὴς Ἀπόστολος ἦν. Chryl. in 1 Cor. 9. 2. Οὗτος ὁ ἐκ οἰκίας μᾶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶν, καὶ δὴ μὲν, καὶ ἐθνῶν, καὶ ὁλοκλήρως τῆς οἰκουμενῆς προήδρα ἔχων. Chryl. in 2 Cor. 11. 28. Τῆς οἰκουμενῆς ἀνταμείβετο πάσης, καὶ διακυβεύει τὰς Ἐκκλησίας. Chryl. Tom. 8. p. 115. Ἡ οἰκουμενὴ πᾶσα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔβλεπεν, αἱ προήδρες τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἀείνης ψυχῆς ἦν ἐξαρτημέναι — Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 59. Ὁ Μιχαὴλ τὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐθνοῦς ἐκείνη Πάυλος τῆς ὁλοκλήρου, καὶ τῆς οἰκουμενῆς, καὶ τῆς ἀόικητον. Chryl. Tom. 8. p. 39.

And could Saint Peter have a larger Flock committed to him? could this charge, feed my sheep, more agree to him, than to those, who no less than he were obliged to feed all Christian people every where?

7. The words indeed are applicable to all Christian Bishops and Governors of the Church; according to that of St. Cyprian, to Pope Stephen himself, We being many Shepherds do feed one Flock, and all the Sheep of Christ, for they are stiled Pastors; they in terms as in-

Paulus Apostolus boni Pastoris implebat Officium, quando Christum predicabat Aug. in Joh. 17. 47.

Paul fulfilled the Office of a good Pastor, when he preached Christ.

Principes Disciplina nostra, & Christiani Dogmatis duces. Hier. in Jovin. 1. 14.

Matt. 10. 6. 9. 36.

Matt. 28. 19, 20.

Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. Cyp. de Un. Eccl.

\* Ἀρχόντες εἰσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ χειροτονηθέντες οἱ Ἀπόστολοι Ἀρχιερεῖς ἐκ ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεως διαφόρους λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ πάντες κοινῇ τῇ οἰκουμενῇ ἐμπιστευμένοι. Chryl. Tom. 8. p. 115.

Kai ὁ τῆς

pr. of. com-

ment ad

Joh.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

Chryl.

definite

definite as those in this text are exhorted *to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood*; to them (as the Fathers commonly suppose) this Injunction doth reach, our Lord when he spake thus to Saint Peter, intending to lay a charge on them all to express their love and piety toward them in this way, by feeding his Sheep and People.

*Et usq; ad sanguinem adversus peccatum, quibus oves ipsas pascendas, hoc est docendas regendâq; committit.*  
*Aug. in Joh. tr. 123.*

How much more ought they to contend for the truth even unto death, and against sin even unto blood, to whom he committeth his Sheep to be fed, that is to be taught and governed.

*Quas oves, Et quem gregem non solum  
tunc B. suscepit Petrus, sed Et cum eo nos  
suscepimus omnes. Ambr. de Sacerd. 2.*

Τὰ πρόβατα, ἃ τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ τοῖς  
 μετ' αὐτὸν ἐπέχεμεν. Chryf. de Sa-  
 cerd. I.

Cum dicitur Petro, ad omnes dicitur,  
Pasce oves meas. Aug de Agone Christ. 30.

Καὶ τότε παρ' αὐτῷ Χριστῷ παιδόμεθα,  
Πένον ποιμένα μὲν' ἑαυτὸν τῆς Ἐκκλη-  
σίας καθεστῶτον, Πάτερ, ὃ οὐσί, φιλέῃς  
με πλὴν τέκνον; ποίμαίη τὰ πρὸβατά  
με καὶ πᾶσι δι' τὴν ὁρὴν ποιμῆσι καὶ  
διδασκαλοῖς τῷ ἴσῳ παρέχοντι; Ἰη-  
σοῦν καὶ τότε σμῆνον τὸ δεκνὲν ἀπαν-  
τες ὁμοῦς, καὶ λύνει ὅσους κύνει. Baf.  
Const. Mon. cap. 22.

Et qui-  
dem, frā-

*Et qui-* Saint *Austin* compriseth all these considerations in those words.

tres, quod Pastor est, dedit  $\mathfrak{E}$  membris suis; nam  $\mathfrak{E}$  Petrus Pastor,  $\mathfrak{E}$  Paulus Pastor,  $\mathfrak{E}$  ceteri Apostoli Pastores,  $\mathfrak{E}$  boni Episcopi Pastores. Aug. in Joh. tr. 47.

And indeed, brethren, that which a Pastor is, he gave also to his members, for both Peter was a Pastor, and Paul a Pastor, and the rest of his Apostles were Pastors, and good Bishops are Pastors.

How could these great Masters more clearly express their mind, that our Lord in those words to Saint *Peter* did inculcate a duty no-wise peculiar to him, but equally together with him belonging to all Guides of the Church; but in such manner, as when a Master doth press a duty on one Servant, he doth thereby admonish all his Servants of the like duty; whence St. *Austin* saith, that St. *Peter* in that case *did sustain the person of the Church*, that which was spoken to him, belonging to all its members, especially to his Brethren the Clergy.

*Ut ergo  
Petrus  
quando ei  
dictum*

Ut ergo  
Petrus  
quando ei  
dictum  
est, Tibi

*dabo claves, in figura personam gestabat Ecclesiæ, sic Et quando ei dictum est, Pafce oves meas, Ecclesiæ quoque personam in figura gestabat. Aug. in Psal. 108.*

Οὐ πρὸς ἑαυτῶν τὸ τοῦτο μόνον εἰρηγί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστον ἡμῶν ἡμῶν καὶ μακρὸν ἐμπροσθεν ὄντων πατριῶν. Chryf. in  
Matt. 24. Or. 77.

This was not spoken to those Priests only, but to every one of us, who have the care even of a little Flock committed to us.

Διδασκα-  
λοις δὲ  
γνώσις  
διὰ τῆς  
παρα-  
κλήσεως  
ἐν τῇ  
ἐκείνῃ

*It was (saith Cyril) a lesson to Teachers, that they cannot otherwise please the Arch-pastor of all, than by taking care of the welfare of the rational Sheep.*

8. Hence it followeth, that the Sheep, which our Saviour biddeth Saint *Peter* to feed, were not the Apostles, who were his Fellow-shepherds.



herds, designed to feed others, and needing not to be fed by him; but the common Believers or People of God, which Saint Peter himself doth call *the Flock of God*; Feed, saith he to his Fellow-elders, *the flock of God*, 1 Pet. 2.5. *which is among you*; and Saint Paul, *Take heed therefore unto your selves*, Act. 20.28. *and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers.*

9. Take feeding for what you please; for Teaching, for Guiding-- the Apostles were not fit objects of it, who were immediately taught, and guided by God himself.

Hence we may interpret that saying of St. Chrysostom, which is the most plausible argument they can alledge for them, that our Lord in saying this, did commit to Saint Peter a charge (or presidency) over his brethren; that is, he made him a Pastor of Christian people, as he did others; at least, if *πρωτοκλήτος* be referred to the Apostles, it must not signify authority over them, but at most a primacy of order among them; for that Saint Peter otherwise should feed them, St. Chrysostom could hardly think, who presently after saith, that *seeing the Apostles were to receive the administration of the whole world, they ought not afterward to converse with one another; for that would surely have been a great damage to the world.*

Ἐγκεινεν τὸ πρῶτον τῷ ἀδελφῷ.  
Chryl. in Joh. 21. 15.  
Τὸ πρῶτον ἐκείνην τὴν ἀδελφῶν. in  
ver. 21.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν τῶν ἐπιστῶν ἀναβέβαιον, ἐκ τούτου συνέπε-  
πλήχθη λοιπὸν ἀλλήλοις· ἢ δὲ ἀν με-  
γάλη τὸ τοῦ οἰκουμενικοῦ γέροντος ζημία. Ibid.  
V. 23.

10. But they, forsooth, must have Saint Peter solely obliged to feed all Christ's Sheep; so they did impose upon him a vast and crabbed Province; a task very incommodious, or rather impossible for him to undergo: how could he in duty be obliged, how could he in effect be able to feed so many flocks of Christian people scattered about in distant Regions, through all Nations under Heaven: he, poor man, that had so few helps, that had no Officers or Dependents, nor wealth to maintain them, would have been much put to it to feed the Sheep in Britain, and in Parthia; unto infinite distraction of thoughts such a charge must needs have engaged him.

But for this their great Champion hath a fine expedient; Saint Peter, saith he, *did feed Christ's whole flock, partly by himself, partly by others*; so that, it seemeth, the other Apostles were Saint Peter's Curates, or Vicars and Deputies: this indeed were an easy way of feeding; thus although he had slept all his time, he might have fed all the Sheep under heaven; thus any man as well might have fed them. But this manner of feeding is, I fear, a later invention, not known so soon in the Church; and it might then seem near as absurd to be a Shepherd, as it is now (in his own account) to be a just man by imputation; that would be a kind of putative pastorage, as this a putative righteousness. However the Apostles, I dare say, did not take themselves to be Saint Peter's Surrogates, but challenged to themselves to be accounted *the Ministers, the Stewards, the Ambassadors of Christ himself*; from whom immediately they received their Orders, in whose name they acted, to whom they constantly refer their Authority, without taking the least notice of Saint Peter, or intimating any dependence on him.

Respondeo, S. Petrum partim per se,  
partim per alios universum Dominicum  
gregem ut sibi imperatum erat pascisse—  
Beil. de Ponr. R. 1. 16.

2 Cor. 4. 1. } Ec.  
2 Cor. 5. 20. 10. 8.  
Gal. 1. 1. Tit. 1. 3.

It was therefore enough for Saint Peter, that had he Authority restrained to no place, but might, as he found occasion, preach the Gospel,

Gospel, convert, confirm, guide Christians every where to truth and duty; nor can our Saviour's words be forced to signify more.

In fine, this (together with the precedent Testimonies) must not be interpreted so as to thwart Practice and History; according to which it appeareth, that Saint *Peter* did not exercise such a Power, and therefore our Lord did not intend to confer such an one upon him.

P. Leo IX.  
Ep. 1.  
*Ad eju-*  
*dem pri-*  
*matūs*  
*confirma-*  
*tionem.*  
Ec. Bell.  
1. 17.

IV. Farther in confirmation of their Doctrine they do draw forth a whole shole of Testimonies, containing divers Prerogatives, as they call them, of Saint *Peter*; which do, as they suppose, imply this Primacy; so very-sharp-sighted indeed they are, that in every remarkable accident befalling him, in every action performed by him or to him, or about him, they can descry some argument or shrewd insinuation of his preheminance; especially being aided by the glosses of some fanciful Expofitor. From the change of his Name, from his walking on the Sea, from his miraculous draught of Fish, from our Lord's praying for him, that his Faith should not fail, and bidding him to confirm his Brethren; from our Lord's ordering him to pay the tribute for them both; from our Lord's first washing his feet, and his first appearing to him after the Resurrection; from the prediction of his Martyrdom; from sick Persons being cured by his shadow; from his sentencing *Ananias* and *Sapphira* to death, from his preaching to *Cornelius*, from its being said that he passed through all, from his being prayed for by the Church, from Saint *Paul's* going to visit him; from these passages, I say, they deduce or confirm his Authority: Now in earnest is not this stout arguing? is it not egregious modesty for such a point to alledge such proofs? what cause may not be countenanced by such rare fetches? who would not suspect the weakness of that Opinion, which is fain to use such forces in its maintenance? In fine, is it honest or conscionable dealing so to wrest or play with the Holy Scripture, pretending to derive thence proofs, where there is no shew of consequence?

To be even with them, I might assert the Primacy of Saint *John*, and to that purpose might alledge his Prerogatives (which indeed may seem greater than those of Saint *Peter*,) namely, that he was the beloved Disciple, that he leaned on our Lord's breast, that Saint *Peter*, not presuming to ask our Lord a question, desired him to do it, as having a more special confidence with our Lord; that Saint *John* did higher service to the Church, and all Posterity, by writing not only more Epistles,

\* *Infinita futurorum mysteria continentem.* Hier.  
Containing infinite mysteries of future things.

† Joh. 20. 4.

*Petrus Apostolus est, & Joannes Apostolus, maritus & Virgo; sed Petrus Apostolus tantum, Joannes & Apostolus & Evangelista & Propheta, &c.* Hier. in Jovin. 1. 14.

*Et ut brevi sermone multa comprehendam, doceam; cujus privilegii sit Joannes. — uno in Joanne Virginitas; a Domino Virgine mater Virgo Virgini Discipulo commendatur.* Hier. ibid.

but also a most divine Gospel, and a sublime \* Prophecy concerning the state of the Church; that Saint *John* did † out-run *Peter*, and came first to the Sepulchre, (in which passage such acute devisers would find out marvellous significancy) that Saint *John* was a Virgin; that he did out live all the Apostles (and thence was most fit to be Universal Pastor;) that St. Hierom comparing *Peter* and *John*, doth seem to prefer the latter; for *Peter* (saith he) was an Apostle, and *John* was an Apostle; but *Peter* was only an Apostle, *John* both an Apostle and an Evangelist, and also a Prophet, — and (saith he) that I may in brief speech comprehend many things, and shew what privilege belongeth to *John*, — yea virginity in *John*; by our Lord a Virgin, his Mother the Virgin is commended to the Virgin Disciple: thus I might by Prerogatives and

Passages very notable infer the Superiority of Saint *John* to Saint *Peter*,  
in

in imitation of their reasoning; but I am afraid they would scarce be at the trouble to answer me seriously, but would think it enough to say I trifled; wherefore let it suffice for me in the same manner to put off those levities of discourse.

V. They argue this Primacy from the constant placing Saint Peter's name before the other Apostles, in the Catalogues and Narrations concerning him and them.

To this I answer,

1. That this Order is not so strictly observed, as not to admit some exceptions; for Saint Paul saith, that James, Cephas, and John, knowing *Gal. 2.9.* the grace given unto him — so it is commonly read in the ordinary Copies, in the Text of ancient Commentators, and in old Translations; and, whether Paul, whether Apollo, whether Cephas, saith Saint Paul *1 Cor. 3.* again; and, As the other Apostles, and the Brethren of our Lord, and Cephas; and Philip (saith Saint John) was of Bethsaida, the City of Andrew *1 Cor. 9. 5.* and Peter; and Clemens Alex. in Eusebius saith, that the Lord after his resurrection delivered the special knowledge to James the Just, and to John, and to Peter, post-poning Saint Peter, as perhaps conceiving him to have less of sublime Revelations imparted to him; that Order therefore is not so punctually constant.

Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ  
καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν παρίστα τῶν γινώσκον  
Κύριον. Euseb. Hist. 2. 1.

In the Apostolical Constitutions, Saint Paul and Saint Peter being induced jointly prescribing Orders, they begin, I Paul, and I Peter do appoint — so little ambitious or curious of precedence are they represented.

Εγὼ Παῦ-  
λος καὶ  
Ἰωάννης  
Πέτρος  
ἀποστο-  
λοι —  
μὲν —  
Conf. Apost. 8. 33.

2. But it being indeed so constant as not to seem casual, I farther say, that position of names doth not argue difference of degree, or superiority in power; any small advantage of age, standing, merit, or wealth, serving to ground such precedence, as common experience doth shew.

3. We formerly did assign other sufficient and probable causes, why Saint Peter had this place. So that this is no cogent Reason.

VI. Farther, (and this indeed is far their most plausible argumentation) they alledge the Titles and Elogies given to Saint Peter by the Fathers; who call him ἑξαρχον (the Prince) κορυφαίον (the Ring-leader) κεφαλῶν (the Head) \* προέδρον (the President) ἀρχηγόν (the Captain) προήγον (the Proloquutor) πρωτοστάτην (the Foreman) προστάτην (the Warden) ἐκλεκτον τῶν Ἀποστόλων (the choice, or egregious Apostle) Majorem (the greater, or Grandee among them) primum (the first, or prime Apostle.)

\* Chryf.  
Tom. 3.  
Or. 59.  
Chryf. in  
Joh. 21.  
Cyr. c.  
Jul. 9.  
(p. 32.)  
Aug. Ep.  
11. 19.

To these and the like allegations I answer,

1. If we should say, that we are not accountable for every hyberbolical flash or flourish occurring in the Fathers, (it being well known, that they in their encomiastick speeches, as Orators are wont, following the heat and gaiety of fancy, do sometimes overlash) we should have the pattern of their greatest Controvertists to warrant us; for Bellarmine doth put off their Testimonies, by saying, that they do sometimes speak in way of excess, less properly, less warily, so as to need benign Exposition; &c. as Bishop Andrews sheweth; and it is a common shift

The truth is, the best Arguments of the Papists in other questions are some flourishes of Orators, speaking hyperbolically and heedlessly.

Per excessum loqui. Bell. de Miss. 2. 10.  
minus propriè. 3. 4. benignâ expositione  
opus habere. de amiss. gr. 4. 12. minus;  
cauté. de purg. 1. 11.

\* Tort, Tort. p. 338.



\* Dall. de of. P. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 158. (3 p. 314.)

of Cardinal Perron, whereof you may see divers instances alledged by \* M. Dallée.

Nunc enim in consorium individue

unitatis assumptum id quod ipse erat voluit nominari. P. Leo I. Ep. 89. Nihil à bonorum fonte Deo in ququam sine Petri participatione transire. P. Leo de assumpt. sua. Serm. 3.

Which observation is especially applicable to this case; for that eloquent men do never more exceed in their indulgence to fancy, than in the demonstrative kind, in panegyricks, in their commendations of persons; and I hope they will embrace this way of reckoning for those expressions of Pope Leo, founding so exorbitantly, that Saint Peter was by our Lord assumed into consortship of his individual unity; and that nothing did pass upon any from God, the fountain of good things, without the participation of Peter.

2. We may observe, that such turgid Elogies of Saint Peter are not found in the more ancient Fathers; for Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Clemens Alex. Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian—— when they mention Saint Peter, do speak more temperately and simply, according to the current notions and traditions of the Church in their time; using indeed fair terms of respect, but not such high streins of courtship, about him. But they are found in the latter Fathers, who being men of wit and eloquence, and affecting in their discourses to vent those faculties, did speak more out of their own invention and fancy.

Whence according to a prudent estimation of things in such a case, the silence or sparingness of the first sort is of more consideration on the one hand, than the speech, how free soever, of the latter is on the other hand: and we may rather suppose those titles do not belong to Saint Peter, because the first do not give them, than that they do, because the other are so liberal in doing it.

Indeed if we consult the Testimonies of this kind alledged by the Romanists, who with their utmost diligence have raked all ancient Writings for them, it is strange that they cannot find any very ancient ones; that they can find so few plausible ones; that they are fain (to make up the number) to produce so many, which evidently have no force or pertinency; being only commendations of his Apostolical Office, or of his Personal Merits, without relation to others.

3. We say, that all those terms of Titles, which they urge, are ambiguous, and applicable to any sort of Primacy or Preheminency; to that which we admit, no less than to that which we refuse; as by instances from good Authors, and from common use, might easily be demonstrated; so that from them nothing can be inferred advantageous to their cause.

Cic. de Nat. D. lib. 2. Cic. de clar. Orat.

Cicero calleth Socrates, Prince of the Philosophers; and Sulpitius, Prince of all Lawyers; would it not be ridiculous thence to infer, that Socrates was a Sovereign Governor of the Philosophers, or Sulpitius of the Lawyers?

Quem omnium judicio longè principem esse Civitatis videbat—— Principem orbis terræ virum—— Cic. pro domo sua.

The same great Speaker calleth Pompey Prince of the City in all Men's judgment; doth he mean, that he did exercise jurisdiction over the City?

Act. 24. 5. Tertullus calleth Saint Paul, ἡγετοῦτον, a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes; and St. Basil calleth Eustathius Sebastennus, foreman of the sect of the Pneumatomachi;

Προεδρεύον τῶν πνευματομαχῶν αὐτοῦ. Bas. Ep. 74.

did Tertullus mean, that Saint Paul had universal Jurisdiction over Christians; or St. Basil, that Eustathius was Sovereign of those Hereticks?

So neither did Prince of the Apostles, or any equivalent term, in the sense of those who assigned it to Saint *Peter*, import Authority over the Apostles, but eminency among them in worth, in merit, in Apostolical performances, or at most in order of precedence.

Such words are to be interpreted by the state of things, not the state of things to be inferred from them; and in understanding them we should observe the Rule of *Tertullian*.

*rei quam ad sonum vocabuli exerceas. Tert. ad Prax. cap. 3.* I had rather you would apply your self to the sense of the thing, than to the sound of the word.

Οὐ γὰρ αἱ λέξεις τὸ φύσιν ἀφαιροῦν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἡ φύσις τὰς λέξεις εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἵλασσα μεταβάλλει. Athan. Orat. 3. ad. Ar. (p. 373)

For words do not take away the nature of things, but the nature rather changes the words, and draws them to it self.

4. Accordingly the *Fathers* sometimes do explain those Elogies signifying them to import the special gifts and virtues of Saint *Peter*, wherein he did excel; so *Eusebius* calleth Saint *Peter*, the most *Euseb. excellent and great Apostle*, who for his virtue was proloquutor of the *Hist. 2. 14. rest.*

5. This answer is thoroughly confirmed from hence; that even those who gave those Titles to Saint *Peter*, do yet expressly affirm other Apostles in power and dignity equal to him.

Who doth give higher Elogies to him than *St. Chrysostom*? yet doth he assert all the Apostles to be Supreme, and equal in dignity; and particularly he doth often affirm Saint *Paul* to be ἰσότημον, equal in honour to Saint *Peter*, as we before shewed.

The like we declared of *St. Hierom*, *St. Cyril*, &c. And as for *St. Cyprian*, who did allow a Primacy to Saint *Peter*, nothing can be more evident, than that he took the other Apostles to be equal to him in power and honour.

The like we may conceive of *St. Austin*, who having carefully perused those Writings of *St. Cyprian*, and frequently alledging them, doth never contradict that his Sentiment.

Even Pope *Gregory* himself acknowledgeth Saint *Peter* not to have been properly the Head, but only the first member of the universal Church; all being members of the Church under one Head.

*S. & universalis Ecclesia — sub uno capite omnes membra sunt Ecclesie. Greg. I. Epist. 4. 38.*

6. If Pope *Leo I.* or any other ancient Pope, do seem to mean farther, we may reasonably except against their Opinion, as being singular, and proceeding from partial affection to their See; such affection having influence on the mind of the wisest men; according to that certain maxim of *Aristotle*, every man is a bad Judge in his own case.

7. The Ancients, when their subject doth allure them, do adorn other Apostles with the like titles, equalling those of Saint *Peter*, and not well consistent with them, according to that rigour of sense, which our Adversaries affix to the commendations of Saint *Peter*.

The Epistle of *Clement Rom.* to Saint *James* (an Apocryphal, but ancient Writing) calleth Saint *James* our Lord's Brother, The Bishop of Bishops; the *Clementine Recognitions* call him The Prince of Bishops; *Ruffinus*, in his translation of *Eusebius*, The Bishop of the Apostles;

Κλήμενς Ἰακώβῳ — ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ.  
Jacobum Episcoporum Principem Sacerdotum Princeps orabat. Clem. Rec. 1. 68.  
Apostolorum Episcopus. Ruf. Euseb. 2. 1.

\* *St. Chry-*

\* It is likely that *Ruffinus* did call him so by mistaking that in the Apostolical Constitutions.

Ἰπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἡμεῶν Ἰακώβου. *Apost. Const.* 8. 10.

τῶν ὅτι Ἰουδαίων πειρασάντων περὶ εἰρήνης πάντων. *Chryl. Tom. 5. Or. 59.*

τὸν δὲ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον, τὸν ἱερέων ἡγούμενον, τὸν Ἀποστόλων δὲ ἑξαρχόν, τὸν ἐν κεφαλῇ κορυφαίον, &c. *Hefych. Presb. apud Phot. Cod. 275. (p. 1525.)*

Ὁ δὲ χροῖς τὸν Ἀποστόλων περὶ πάντων, ὁ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σῦλον, ὁ περὶ Πέτρου Πέτρε, ὁ δὲ διὰ μέλιτος διὰ μέλιτος, ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπαρχὴ — *Hefych. apud Phot. Cod. 269.*

Ὁ σῦλον τὸν καὶ τὸν οἰκονομῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὁ τῆς κλῆς ἐξων τὸν ἕσπον, &c. *Chryl. in Joh. 1. 1.*

But as occasion of speaking about Saint Paul was more frequent, so the elogies of him are more copious, and indeed so high as not to yield to those of Saint Peter.

Ὁ τῶν ἀρίων χροῖς κορυφαῖος, καὶ περὶ πάντων. *Chryl. in Rom. 16. 24.*

Ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης Ἀπόστολος. *Chryl. in 1 Cor. 9. 2.*

Ἡ γλῶσσα τῆς οἰκουμένης, τὸ φῶς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ὁ διὰ μέλιτος τῆς πίστεως, ὁ σῦλον, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τῆς ἀληθείας.

τὸν οἰκονομῶν ἅπασαν ἐγκαταμενέμεν. — He had the whole habitable World committed to his charge.

τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος ὢν καὶ τὸν οἰκονομῶν ἅπασαν ὁπτιτεγνίς.

He was the Teacher of the World, and had all the inhabitants of the Earth committed to his trust.

He was the light of the Churches, the foundation of Faith, the pillar and ground of Truth.

τὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης — He had the patronage of the World committed into his hands.

περὶ ἅπασαν ἐγκαταμενέμεν. *in Jud. Or. 6. τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸν περὶ ἅπασαν ἐπιβλέπων. in 1 Cor. Or. 22.*

Οὐδὲν οἰκονομῶν ἅπασαν εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ φέρον ἔθηκεν ὁ Θεός. *Tom. 7. p. 2.*

Did not God put into his hands the whole world?

Ὁ πάσης οἰκουμένης κατεχόμενος. *in 2 Tim. 2. 1.* He had the charge of the whole world.

Πάντων ἀνθρώπων — He was better than all men, greater than the Apostles, and surpassing them all.

Ἱερεὺς — τίς ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀμείνων; τίς δὲ ἱερεὺς, ὃς ἡ ὁ σκηνώσεως ἐμείνῃ, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος — εἰ τίς μὲν ἡμεῖς τὸν Ἀποστόλων λαμβάνειν ἔμελλεν, ἢ τὸν Ἀποστόλων ἵσος ἡμεῖς γέροντες, ἢ τὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς μείζων, ἢ τὸν ὅτι τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀπολαύσει; πῶς καὶ περὶ πάντων. *Tom. 5. Or. 33.*

Who then was better than all other men? who else but that Tent-maker, the Teacher of the world? — If therefore he receive a greater Crown than the Apostles, and none perhaps was equal to the Apostles, and yet he greater than they, it is manifest that he shall enjoy the highest honour and preeminence.

Παύλου λαμπρότερον ἔδεν ἢν, ἔδεν φανερότερον. *Tom. 5. Or. 47.*

Nothing was more bright, nothing more illustrious than he.

Οὐδὲν δὲ ἐκείνου μείζων, ἀλλ' ἔδεν ἴσος ἔδεν. *Tom. 6. Or. 9. Οὐδὲν Παύλου ἴσος ἦν. 2 Tim. 3. 15.*

None was greater than he, yea none equal to him.

Ὁ πάντων, ὁ δὲ ἐκκλησιῶν ἀρχιτέκτων. *Theod. Ep. 146.*

The most wise, and best Architect, or chief Builder of the Churches.

Ὁ μακάριος Ἀπόστολος, ὁ δὲ πατέρων πατήρ. *Iust. M. resp. ad Origen. Qu. 119.*

The blessed Apostle, the Father of the Fathers.

Caput est — Pope Gregory I. faith of Saint Paul, that he was made head of the Nations, because he obtained the principate of the whole Church.

Natio- num; quia obtinuit totius Ecclesie principatum, *Greg. M. in 1 Reg. lib. 4. Vide sit. Paulus Apostolorum Princeps. Ep. Spalat. in Lat. Syn. sub P. Jul. II. Sess. 1. p. 25.*

These



These Characters of Saint Paul I leave them to interpret, and reconcile with those of Saint Peter.

8. That the *Fathers* by calling Saint Peter Prince, Chieftain, &c. of the Apostles, do not mean Authority over them, may be argued from their joyning Saint Paul with him in the same appellations; who yet surely could have no Jurisdiction over them; and his having any would destroy the pretended Ecclesiastical Monarchy.

St. Cyril calleth them together *Patrons*, or *Presidents of the Church*.

St. Austin (or St. Ambr. or Max.) calleth them *Princes of the Churches*.

The Popes Agatho and Adrian (in their General Synods) call them the *ring-leading Apostles*.

The Popes Nicholas I. and Gregory VII. &c. call them *Princes of the Apostles*.

St. Ambrose, or St. Austin, or St. Maximus Taur. (chuse you which) doth thus speak of them; Blessed Peter and Paul are most eminent among all the Apostles, excelling the rest by a kind of peculiar prerogative: but whether of the two be preferred before the other is uncertain; for I count them to be equal in merit, because they are equal in suffering, &c.

To all this discourse I shall only add, that if any of the Apostles, or Apostolical men, might claim a presidency or authoritative Headship over the rest, Saint James seemeth to have the best title thereto; for Jerusalem was the Mother of all Churches, the Fountain of the Christian Law and Doctrine, the See of our Lord himself, the chief Pastor.

*lem fundata totius orbis Ecclesias seminavit.* Hieron. in Isa. 2. The Church founded in Jerusalem was the Seminary of the Churches throughout the whole world.

Theod. 5. 9. Vide Tert. de Prescr. cap. 20.

He therefore, who (as the *Fathers* tells us) was by our Lord himself constituted Bishop of that City, and the first of all Bishops, might best pretend to be in special manner our Lord's Vicar or Successor.

He (saith Epiphanius) did first receive the Episcopal Chair, and to him our Lord first did entrust his own Throne upon Earth.

James. I suppose to his Brother; for he is said to have ordained him, and made him the first Bishop of Jerusalem. *Πρωτὸς δὲ εἰληπε ἡ καθέδρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ἣν παύλος κῆρυξεν ὡς δόνον αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς πρῶτω.* Epiph. her. 78.

He accordingly did first exercise the Authority of presiding and moderating in the first Ecclesiastical Synod, as St. Chrysostom in his Notes thereon doth remark.

He therefore probably by Saint Paul is first named in his report concerning the passages at Jerusalem; and to his orders it seemeth that Saint Peter himself did conform; for 'tis said there, that before certain came from Saint James he did eat with the Gentiles, but when they were come he withdrew.

Hence in the Apostolical Constitutions, in the Prayer prescribed for the Church, and for all the Governors of it, the Bishops of the principal

*Πίτερὸς καὶ Παύλος, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρῶτοι.* Cyril. Cat. 6.

*Ecclesiarum Principes.* Aug. de Sanct. 27.

*Κορυφαῖοι Ἀποστόλων.* P. Agatho in 6 Syn. Act. 4. p. 35. P. Adrian in 7 Syn. Act. 2. p. 554.

Nicol. I. Ep. 7. Plat. in Greg. VII. Sc.

*Beati Petrus & Paulus eminent inter Universos Apostolos, & peculiari quadam prerogativa precellunt; verum inter ipsos quis cui præponatur incertum est, puto enim illos æquales esse meritis, quia æquales sunt passionibus.* Sc. Ambr. Serm. 66. Aug. de Sanct. 27. Max. Taur. Serm. 54.

*Hæ voces Ecclesie, ex qua habuit omnis Ecclesia initium.* Iren. 3. 12.

These are the words of the Church, from whence every Church had its beginning.

Isa. 2. 3. Luke 14. 47.

*Ecclesia in Hierusa-*

*Ἐπειτα ὡς ἐν Ἱερουσολέμῃ, ἡμεῖς δοῦναι τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτῷ αὐτὸς ὅτι αὐτὸν λέγεται καὶ χειροτονήσαντα, καὶ ἐπισκοπὸν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμοις παποικάναι πρῶτον.* Chryl. in 1 Cor. Or. 11.

After that he was seen of

cipal Churches being specified by name; Saint James is put in the first place; before the Bishops of Rome, and of Antioch; *Let us pray for the whole Episcopacy under Heaven of those who rightly dispense the word of thy Truth; and let us pray for our Bishop James with all his Parish;* let us pray for our Bishops Clemens and all his Parish; let us pray for Evodius and all his Parish. —

Hereto consenteth the Tradition of those ancient Writers afore-  
cited, who call Saint James, *the Bishop of Bishops, the Bishop of the Apo-*  
*stles, &c.*

## S U P P O S I T I O N   I I .

I proceed to examine the next *Supposition* of the Church Monarchists, which is, *That Saint Peter's Primacy, with its Rights and Prerogatives, was not personal, but derivable to his Successors.*

**A**gainst which *Supposition* I do assert, that admitting a Primacy of Saint *Peter*, of what kind or to what purpose soever, we yet have reason to deem it merely personal, and (not according to its grounds and its design) communicable to any Successors, nor indeed in effect conveyed to any such.

Privilegium personale Personam sequitur, & cum Persona extinguitur. Reg. Juris, 7. in Sexto.

It is a rule in the Canon Law; That a *personal Privilege* doth follow the Person, and is *extinguished with the Person*; and such we affirm that of Saint Peter; for,

1. His Primacy was grounded upon personal acts (such as his cheerful following of *Christ*, his faithful confessing of *Christ*, his resolute adherence to *Christ*, his embracing special Revelations from God) or upon personal graces (his great Faith, his special Love to our Lord, his singular Zeal for *Christ*'s Service) or upon personal gifts and endowments (his courage, resolution, activity, forwardness in apprehension, and in speech) the which advantages are not transient, and consequently a preeminency built on them is not in its nature such.

2. All the pretence of Primacy granted to Saint *Peter* is grounded upon words directed to Saint *Peter's* Person, characterized by most personal adjuncts, as name, parentage, and which exactly were accomplished in Saint *Peter's* personal actings, which therefore it is unreasonable to extend farther.

**Matt. 16.**

17.

Joh. 21. 15,

16, 17.

Matt. 16.

17.

Our Lord promised to *Simon Son of Jona*, to build his Church on him; accordingly in eminent manner the Church was founded upon his Ministry, or by his first preaching, testimony, performances.

Our Lord promised to give him the Keys of the Heavenly Kingdom; this Power Saint *Peter* signally did execute in converting Christians, and receiving them by Baptism into the Church, by conferring the Holy Ghost, and the like administrations.

Joh. 21. 15.

Our Lord charged *Simon Son of Jonas* to feed his Sheep; this he performed by preaching, writing, guiding and governing Christians, as he found opportunity; wherefore if any thing was couched under those promises

promises or orders, singularly pertinent to Saint *Peter*; for the same reason that they were singular, they were personal; for,

These things being, in a conspicuous manner accomplished in St. *Peter's* Person, the sense of those words is exhausted; there may not, with any probability, there cannot with any assurance be any more grounded on them; whatever more is inferred, must be by precarious assumption; and justly we may cast at those who shall infer it that expostulation of *Tertullian*, *What art thou, who dost overturn and change the manifest intention of our Lord, personally conferring this on Peter?*

*Qualis es evertens atque commutans manifestam Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem? Tertul. de pud. 21.*

3. Particularly the grand promise to Saint *Peter* of founding the Church on him cannot reach beyond his person; because there can be no other foundations of a Society, than such as are first laid; the Successors of those, who first did erect a Society, and establish it, are themselves but superstructures.

4. The Apostolical Office as such was personal and temporary; and therefore according to its nature and design not successive or communicable to others in perpetual descendance from them.

It was, as such, in all respects extraordinary, conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes, discharged by special aids, endowed with special privileges, as was needful for the propagation of Christianity, and founding of Churches.

To that Office it was requisite, that the Person should have an immediate designation and commission from God; such as Saint *Paul* so often doth insist upon for asserting his title to the Office; *Paul an Apostle, not from men, or by man—not by men*, saith St. *Chrysostom*, *this is a property of the Apostles*.

*Gal. 1. 1. Τὸ ὅτι δὲ ἀνθρώπων τὸτο ἰδίον τῶν Ἀποστόλων. Chrys. Ibid.*

It was requisite that an Apostle should be able to attest concerning our Lord's Resurrection or Ascension, either immediately as the twelve, or by evident consequence as Saint *Paul*; thus Saint *Peter* implied, at the choice of *Matthias*, *Wherefore of those men, which have companied with us—must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the Resurrection; and, Am I not (saith Saint Paul) an Apostle, have I not seen the Lord?* according to that of *Ananias*, *The God of our Fathers hath chosen thee that thou shouldest know his will, and see that just one, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth; for thou shalt bear witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.*

*Act. 1. 21. 1 Cor. 9. 1. 15. 8. Act. 23. 14.*

It was needful also that an Apostle should be endowed with miraculous gifts and graces, enabling him both to assure his Authority, and to execute his Office; wherefore Saint *Paul* calleth these, *the marks of an Apostle*, the which were wrought by him among the *Corinthians* in all patience (or persevering) in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

*2 Cor. 12. 12. Rom. 15. 13.*

It was also in St. *Chrysostom's* opinion, proper to an Apostle, that he should be able according to his discretion in a certain and conspicuous manner to impart Spiritual Gifts; as Saint *Peter* and Saint *John* did at *Samaria*; which to do, according to that Father, was the peculiar gift and privilege of the Apostles.

*Τὸτο δὲ τὸ δῶρον μόνον τῶν*

*ἰδὲνα—τὸτο δὲ τὸ δῶν ἂν Ἀποστόλων ὁ Χρυσόστομος. Chryl. in Act. 8. 18.*

*De solis Apostolis legitur, quorum vicem tenent Episcopi, quod per manus impositionem Spiritum S. dabant. P. Eugenius IV. Injtit. dnm.*

'Tis recorded of the Apostles alone, in whose room the Bishops succeed, that they gave the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands.

L

It



It was also a privilege of an Apostle, by virtue of his commission from *Christ to instruct all Nations* in the Doctrine and Law of *Christ*; He had right and warrant to exercise his function every where, *His charge was universal and indefinite; the whole world was his Province*; he was not affixed to any one place, nor could be excluded from any; he was (as *St. Cyril* calleth him) an *Oecumenical Judge*, and an *Instructor of all the Subcelestial World*.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡμεῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας  
τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν. Chryl. in Joh. 21.

Κεῖται οἰκουμένη, καὶ τὸ ὅλον τὸν κόσμον  
ἡγεῖται. Cyril. γλαφ. in Gen. 7.

Apostles also did govern in an absolute manner, according to discretion, as being guided by infallible assistance, to the which they might upon occasion appeal, and affirm, *It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and us*. Whence their Writings have passed for inspired; and therefore Canonical, or certain Rules of Faith and Practice.

Act. 15.  
28.

It did belong to them to found Churches, to constitute Pastors, to settle orders, to correct offences, to perform all such Acts of Sovereign, Spiritual Power, in virtue of the same Divine assistance, according to the Authority, which the Lord had given them for edification; as we see practised by Saint Paul.

Τὴν Ἀποστολὴν προσέταται πλείων ἀγαθῶν  
ἔργων, ἢ χρονοῦ ἀρκούντος καὶ μέλλοντος  
καὶ ἀεὶ κινήσων. Chryl. in Rom. 1. Or. 1.  
Tom. 8. p. 114.

In fine, the Apostleship was (as *St. Chrysostom* telleth us) a business fraught with ten thousand good things; both greater than all privileges of grace, and comprehensive of them.

Now such an Office, consisting of so many extraordinary privileges and miraculous powers, which were requisite for the foundation of the Church, and the diffusion of Christianity, against the manifold difficulties and disadvantages, which it then needs must encounter, was not designed to continue by derivation; for it containeth in it divers things, which apparently were not communicated, and which no man without gross imposture and hypocrisy could challenge to himself.

Quis nescit  
illum A-  
postolatus  
principatus  
cum cunctis  
bet Epi-  
scopatus  
præferendum?  
Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. 2. 1.  
Episcopi nullam habent partem vere Apostolicæ auctoritatis. Bell. 4. 25.

Neither did the Apostles pretend to communicate it; they did indeed appoint standing Pastors and Teachers in each Church; they did assume Fellow-labourers or Assistants in the work of Preaching and Governance; but they did not constitute Apostles, equal to themselves in Authority, Privileges or Gifts. For who knoweth not (saith *St. Austin*) that principate of Apostleship to be preferred before any Episcopacy? and the Bishops (saith *Bellarmino*) have no part of the true Apostolical Authority. \*

\* The Apostles themselves do make the Apostolate a distinct Office from Pastors and Teachers, which are the standing Offices in the Church. Ep. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 28.

Wherefore Saint *Peter*, who had no other Office mentioned in Scripture, or known to Antiquity, beside that of an Apostle, could not have properly and adequately any Successor to his Office; but it naturally did expire with his Person, as did that of the other Apostles.

5. Accordingly, whereas the other Apostles, as such, had no Successors, the Apostolical Office not being propagated; the Primacy of Saint *Peter* (whatever it were, whether of Order or Jurisdiction, in regard to his Brethren) did cease with him; for when there were no Apostles extant, there could be no Head, or Prince of the Apostles in any sense.

6. If

6. If some privileges of Saint *Peter* were derived to Popes, why were not all? why was not Pope *Alexander VI.* as holy as Saint *Peter*? why was not Pope *Honorius* as found in his private judgment? why is not every Pope inspired? why is not every Papal Epistle to be reputed Canonical? why are not all Popes endowed with power of doing Miracles? why doth not the Pope by a Sermon convert thousands? (why indeed do Popes never preach?) why doth not he cure men by his shadow? (he is, say they, himself his shadow :) what ground is there of distinguishing the privileges, so that he shall have some, not others? where is the ground to be found?

7. If it be objected, that the *Fathers* commonly do call Bishops Successors of the Apostles; to assail that objection we may consider, that whereas the Apostolical Office virtually did contain the functions of Teaching, and ruling God's people, the which for preservation of Christian doctrine, and edification of the Church, were requisite to be continued perpetually in ordinary standing Offices, these indeed were derived from the Apostles, but not properly in way of succession, as by univocal propagation; but by Ordination, imparting all the power needful for such Offices; which therefore were exercised by persons during the Apostles lives concurrently, or in subordination to them; even as a Dictator at *Rome* might create inferior Magistrates, who derived from him, but not as his Successors; for (as *Bellarmino* himself telleth us) there can be no proper succession but in respect of one preceding, but Apostles and Bishops were together in the Church.

*Non succeditur propriè nisi præcedenti, ac simul fuerunt in Ecclesia Apostoli & Episcopi* — Bell. de Pont. R. 4. 25.

The *Fathers* therefore so in a large sense call all Bishops Successors of the Apostles, not meaning that any of them did succeed into the whole Apostolical Office; but that each did receive his power from some one (immediately or mediately) whom some Apostle did constitute Bishop, vesting him with Authority to feed the particular Flock committed to him in way of ordinary charge; according to the sayings of that Apostolical person, *Clemens Rom.* The Apostles preaching in Regions and Cities, did constitute their first Converts, having approved them by the Spirit, for Bishops and Deacons of those who should afterward believe; and having constituted the foresaid (Bishops and Deacons) they withal gave them farther charge, that if they should die, other approved men successively should receive their Office: thus did the Bishops supply the room of the Apostles, each in guiding his particular charge, all of them together by mutual aid conspiring to govern the whole Body of the Church.

Κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεως κηρύσσοντες καὶ θῆσαν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τὸ πνεῦμα, εἰς ἑποκότους καὶ διακόνους ἢ μαλλόντων πιστέων. Clem. ad Corinth. 1. p. 54.

Κατέστη τὸν ἀρεσκηνώμενον, καὶ μεταξὺ ὁποῦντο ἐπιθεσθῆναι, ὅπως εἰαν κοιμηθῶσι, διακόνων ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς δεσπομασμένοι ἀνδρες τῶν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Ibid. p. 57.

*Singulis pastoribus portio gregis adscripta est, quam regat unusquisque; & gubernet* — Cypr. Ep. 55.

8. In which regard it may be said that not one single Bishop, but all Bishops together through the whole Church do succeed Saint *Peter*, or any other Apostle; for that all of them in union together have an universal Sovereign Authority, commensurate to an Apostle.

9. This is the notion, which St. *Cyprian* doth so much insist upon, affirming that the Bishops do succeed Saint *Peter*, and the other Apostles, by vicarious ordination; that the Bishops are Apostles; that there is but one chair by the Lord's word built upon one *Peter*;

*Præpositos, qui Apostolis vicariâ ordinatione succedunt* — Ep. 69. 42. 75.

*Apostolos, id est, Episcopos & præpositos Dominus elegit.* Ep. 65.

*Cathedra una super Petrum Domini*

voce fundata— Ep. 40. & Ep. 73. & de unit. Eccl.

Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordis numerositate diffusus. Ep. 52.

Episcopatus unus, cuius à singulis in solidum pars tenetur. De unit. Eccl.

Et Pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur. De unit. Eccl.

Nam etsi Pastores multi sumus, unam tamen gregem pascimus, & oves universas, &c. Epist. 67.

For though we are many Pastors, yet we feed one flock, and all the sheep, &c.

Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis, & ipsis solis potestatem à patre sibi datam permittentis quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernantes.

The mind and meaning of our Lord Jesus Christ is manifest in sending his Apostles, and allowing the power given him of the Father to them alone, whose Successors we are, governing the Church of God by the same power.

Τὰ περὶ τὰ— ἀ τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνου ἐνταλείπει. Chryl. de Sacerd. 1.

10. Such, and no other power Saint Peter might devolve on any Bishop ordained by him in any Church; which he did constitute or inspect; as in that of Antioch, of Alexandria, of Babylon, of Rome.

The like did the other Apostles communicate, who had the same power with Saint Peter in founding and settling Churches; whose Successors of this kind were equal to those of the same kind, whom Saint Peter did constitute; enjoying in their several precincts an equal part of the Apostolical power as St. Cyprian often doth assert.

11. It is in consequence observable, that in those Churches, whereof the Apostles themselves were never accounted Bishops, yet the Bishops are called Successors of the Apostles; which cannot otherwise be understood, than according to the sense which we have proposed; that is,

Habemus annumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi, & Successores eorum usq; ad nos— Iren. 3. 3.

Proinde utiq; & ceteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habent. Tert. de Præscr. 32.

Τέταρτος ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὃν αὐτῷ ἐκεῖθεν κληρὸν Πέτρος. Euf. hist. 4. 1.

Primus is the fourth from the Apostles who was the Bishop of that place, or obtained the ministry there.

Ὅπου μὲν Ἐπισκόπος καθίστηται, τοῖς ὅπου δὲ ἡ Ἐκκλησία ἀρμύσων, &c. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. 3. 23.

Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recessus in Joannem statit autorem. Tert. in Marc. 4. 5. Tert. de Præscr. 32.

Unitatem à Domino & per Apostolos nobis successoribus traditam Cyp. Ep. 42.

Adversarii nostri qui Apostolis successimus, Firmil. in Cyp. Ep. 75.

One undivided Bishoprick, diffused in the peaceful numerosity of many Bishops, wherof each Bishop doth hold his share; One Flock whom the Apostles by unanimous agreement did feed, and which afterward the Bishops do feed; having a portion thereof allotted to each, which he should govern.

So the Synod of Carthage with St. Cyprian.

So also St. Chrysostom saith, that the Sheep of Christ were committed by him to Peter, and to those after him, that is, in his meaning, to all Bishops.

We can number those, who were instituted Bishops by the Apostles and their Successors; and, All the Churches do shew those, whom being by the Apostles constituted in the Episcopal Office they have as Continuers of the Apostolical seed.

because they succeeded those, who were constituted by the Apostles; according to those sayings of Irenæus and Tertullian; We can number those, who were instituted Bishops by the Apostles and their Successors; and, All the Churches do shew those, whom being by the Apostles constituted in the Episcopal Office they have as Continuers of the Apostolical seed.

So although Saint Peter was never reckoned Bishop of Alexandria, yet because it is reported that he placed Saint Mark there, the Bishop of Alexandria is said to succeed the Apostles.

And because Saint John did abide at Ephesus, inspecting that Church, and appointing Bishops there, the Bishops of that See did refer their Origin to him.

So many Bishops did claim from Saint Paul.

So St. Cyprian and Firmilian do assert themselves Successors of the Apostles, who yet perhaps never were at Carthage, or Caesarea.

So



So the Church of *Constantinople* is often in the Acts of the Sixth General Council, called *this great Apostolock Church*, being such Churches as those of whom *Tertullian* saith, that *although they do not produce any of the Apostles, or Apostolical men for their Author, yet conspiring in the same faith, and no less, for the consanguinity of doctrine, reputed Apostolical.*

Yea hence *St. Hierom* doth assert a parity of merit and dignity Sacerdotal to all Bishops; because (saith he) *all of them are Successors to the Apostles*; having all a like power by their ordination conferred on them. Hier. ad Evagr.

12. Whereas our Adversaries do pretend, that indeed the other Apostles had an extraordinary charge as Legates of *Christ*, which had no succession, but was extinct in their persons; but that *Saint Peter* had a peculiar charge, as ordinary Pastor of the whole Church, which surviveth: Bell. 4. 25. &c.

To this it is enough to rejoin, that it is a mere figment, devised for a shift, and affirmed precariously; having no ground either in Holy Scripture, or in ancient Tradition; there being no such distinction in the Sacred or Ecclesiastical Writings; no mention occurring there of any Office which he did assume, or which was attributed to him, distinct from that extraordinary one of an Apostle; and all the pastoral charge imaginable being ascribed by the Ancients to all the Apostles in regard to the whole Church, as hath been sufficiently declared.

13. In fine, if any such conveyance of power, (of power so great, so momentous, so mightily concerning the perpetual state of the Church, and of each person therein) had been made; it had been (for general direction and satisfaction, for voiding all doubt and debate about it, for stifling these pretended Heresies and Schisms) very requisite, that it should have been expressed in some authentick Record, that a particular Law should have been extant concerning it, that all posterity should be warned to yield the submission grounded thereon.

Indeed a matter of so great consequence to the being and welfare of the Church, could scarce have escaped from being clearly mentioned somewhere or other in Scripture, wherein so much is spoken touching Ecclesiastical Discipline; it could scarce have avoided the Pen of the first Fathers, (*Clemens, Ignatius, the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, Tertullian, &c.*) who also so much treat concerning the Function and Authority of Christian Governors.

Nothing can be more strange, than that in the *Statute-book* of the new *Jerusalem*, and in all the Original Monuments concerning it, there should be such a dead silence concerning the succession of its chief Magistrate.

Wherefore no such thing appearing, we may reasonably conclude no such thing to have been, and that our Adversaries assertion of it is wholly arbitrary, imaginary and groundless.

14. I might add, as a very convincing Argument, that if such a succession had been designed, and known in old times, it is morally impossible, that none of the Fathers (*Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril, Hierom, Theodoret, &c.*) in their exposition of the places alledged by the *Romanists* for the Primacy of *Saint Peter*, should declare that Primacy to have been derived and settled on *Saint Peter's* Successor; a point of that moment, if they had been aware of it, they could not but have touched, as a most useful application, and direction for duty.

— ab illis Ecclesiis, quæ licet nullum ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis, auctorem suum proferant, aut multo posteriores, quæ deniq; quotidie insituntur, tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus Apostolica deputantur, pro consanguinitate doctrine. Tert. de Prescr. 32.

## SUPPOSITION III.

They affirm, That Saint Peter was Bishop of Rome.

Concerning which Assertion we say, that it may with great reason be denied, and that it cannot any-wise be assured; as will appear by the following Considerations.

1. Saint Peter's being Bishop of Rome would confound the Offices, which God made distinct; for God did appoint first Apostles, then Prophets, then Pastors and Teachers; wherefore Saint Peter after he was an Apostle, could not well become a Bishop; it would be such an irregularity, as if a Bishop should be made a Deacon.

1 Cor. 12.  
28.  
Eph. 4. 11.

2. The Offices of an Apostle, and of a Bishop, are not in their nature well consistent; for the Apostleship is an extraordinary Office, charged

Ἀποστόλῃς εἰσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ χειροτον-  
θέντες οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἄρχοντες, ἡ ἐξου-  
σία διαφόρως λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ πάν-  
τες κοινῇ τῇ οἰκουμένην ἐμψυχύνοντες.  
Chryl. Tom. 8. p. 115.

Οἱ καθήμενοι καὶ οἱ ἵνα τὸ πᾶν ἡγχα-  
νοῦντο. Chryl. in Eph. 4. 11.

with instruction and government of the whole world, and calling for an answerable care (the Apostles being Rulers, as Saint Chrysostom faith, ordained by God; Rulers not taking several Nations and Cities, but all of them in common entrusted with the whole world) but Episcopacy is an ordinary standing charge, affixed to one place, and requiring a special attendance there; Bishops being Pastors, who (as St. Chrysostom faith) do sit, and are employed in one place: Now he that hath

such a general care, can hardly discharge such a particular Office; and he that is fixed to so particular attendance, can hardly look well after so general a charge: Either of those Offices alone would suffice to take up a whole man; as those tell us, who have considered the burthen incumbent on the meanest of them; the which we may see described in St. Chrysostom's Discourses concerning the Priesthood.

Non erat ejus Officii in uno loco consistere, sed quantum homini licuisset universum peragraré orbem, & nondum credentes ad fidem perducere, credentes verò in fide penitus stabilire. Baron. Anno 58. §. 51.

Baronius faith of Saint Peter, that it was his Office, not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did yet believe to the faith, but thoroughly to establish believers; if so, how could he be Bishop of Rome, which was an Office inconsistent with such vagrancy?

3. It would not have becomed Saint Peter the prime Apostle, to assume the charge of a particular Bishop; it had been a degradation of himself, and a disparagement to the Apostolical Majesty, for him to take upon him the Bishoprick of Rome; as if the King should become Mayor of London; as if the Bishop of London should be Vicar of *Pancras*.

4. Wherefore it is not likely, that Saint Peter, being sensible of that superior charge belonging to him, which did exact a more extensive care, would vouchsafe to undertake an inferior charge.

We cannot conceive, that Saint Peter did affect the Name of a Bishop, as now men do, allured by the baits of wealth and power, which then were none: if he did affect the Title, why did he not in either of his Epistles (one of which, as they would persuade us, was written from Rome) inscribe himself Bishop of Rome?

Especially

Especially considering, that being an Apostle, he did not need any particular Authority, that involving all power, and enabling him in any particular place to execute all kinds of Ecclesiastical Administrations: there was no reason that an Apostle (or Universal Bishop) should become a particular Bishop.

5. Also Saint *Peter's* general charge of converting and inspecting the *Jews*, dispersed over the World (*his Apostleship*, as Saint *Paul* calleth it, *of the Circumcision*) which required much travel, and his presence in divers places, doth not well agree to his assuming the Episcopal Office at *Rome*. Gal. 2. 8.  
'Αποστολή  
ἐπιτομῆς.

Especially at that time, when they first make him to assume it; which was in the time of *Claudius*, who (as Saint *Luke*, and other Histories do report) did banish all the *Jews* from *Rome*, as *Tiberius* also had done before him: He was too skilful a Fisherman to cast his Net there, where there was no Fish. Act. 18. 2.  
Sueton. in  
Claud. 25.  
in Tib. 36.

6. If we consider Saint *Peter's* life, we may well deem him incapable of this Office; which he could not conveniently discharge; for it, as History doth represent it, and may be collected from divers circumstances of it, was very unsettled; he went much about the World, and therefore could seldom recide at *Rome*.

Many have argued him to have never been at *Rome*; which opinion I shall not avow, as bearing a more civil respect to ancient Testimonies and Traditions; although many false and fabulous relations of that kind having crept into History and common vogue; many doubtful reports having passed concerning him; many notorious forgeries having been vented about his travels and acts, (all that is reported of him out of Scripture having a smack of the Legend) would tempt a man to suspect any thing touching him, which is grounded only upon human Tradition; so that the forger of his Epistle to Saint *James* might well induce him saying, *If while I do yet survive, men dare to feign such things of me, how much more will they dare to do so after my decease?* Euseb. 3. 3.

But at least the discourses of those men have evinced that it is hard to assign the time, when he was at *Rome*; and that he could never long abide there. For,

The time which old Tradition assigneth of his going to *Rome*, is rejected by divers learned men, even of the *Roman* Party.

He was often in other places; sometimes at *Jerusalem*, sometimes at *Antioch*, sometimes at *Babylon*, sometimes at *Corinth*, sometimes probably at each of those places unto which he directeth his Catholick Epistles; among which *Epiphanius* saith, that *Peter* did often visit *Pontus* and *Bithynia*.

And that he seldom was at *Rome*, may well be collected from Saint *Paul's* Writings; for he writing at different times one Epistle to *Rome*, and divers Epistles from *Rome*, (that to the *Galatians*, that to the *Ephesians*, that to the *Philippians*, that to the *Colossians*, and the *Second* to *Timothy*) doth never mention him, sending any salutation to him, or from him.

Particularly Saint *Peter* was not there, when Saint *Paul* mentioning *Tychicus*, *Onesimus*, *Aristarchus*, *Marcus* and *Justus*, addeth these alone Col. 4. 11.

my

Εἰ δὲ ἔτι ζῶντες ἐπιποιεῖν ταῦτα τολμή-  
σιν καὶ ἄλλοι, πόσω γε μάλλον μετ'  
ἐμὲ ποιεῖν οἱ μετ' ἐμὲ τολμήσουσι; Petr. ad  
Jacob.

Scal. in Euseb. p. 189.  
Onuph. apud Bell. 2. 6.  
Vales. in Euseb. 2. 16.

Act. 11. 2. 15. 7. Gal. 1. 18. 2. 9.  
Gal. 2. 11. 1 Pet. 5. 13.  
1 Cor. 1. 12.  
2 Pet. 3. 2. 1 Pet. 1. 1.

Πέτρος πολλάκις Πόντον καὶ Βιθυνίαν ἐπι-  
σκεύατο. Epiph. har. 27.



my fellow-workers unto the Kingdom of God, who have been a comfort unto me.

<sup>2</sup> Tim. 4. 16. He was not there when Saint Paul said, at my first defence no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.

<sup>2</sup> Tim. 4. 6. He was not there immediately before Saint Paul's death, (when the time of his departure was at hand) when he telleth Timothy, that all the brethren did salute him, and naming divers of them, he omitteth Peter.

Which things being considered, it is not probable that Saint Peter would assume the Episcopal Chair of Rome, he being little capable to reside there, and for that other needful affairs would have forced him to leave so great a Church destitute of their Pastor.

7. It was needless that he should be Bishop, for that by virtue of his Apostleship (involving all the power of inferior degrees) he might when ever he should be at Rome exercise Episcopal functions and Authority. What need a Sovereign Prince be made a Justice of Peace —

<sup>Conc. Nic. Can. 16.</sup> 8. Had he done so, he must have given a bad example of Non-residence, a Practice that would have been very ill relished in the Primitive Church, as we may see by several Canons interdicting offences of kin to it (it being I think then not so known as nominally to be censured) and culpable upon the same ground; and by the sayings of Fathers condemning practices approaching to it.

<sup>Conc. Sard. Can. 11, 12.</sup> Οἷος ἀναγινῶς τὰς γερὰς, ἡλίκον ὅτι δὴ ἐγκλημα καταλιμπάνων Ἐπίσκοπον τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ ἀμελεῖν τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιμνίαν Athan. Apol. 1.

Having read the Scriptures, you know how great an offence it is for a Bishop to forsake his Church, and to neglect the Flocks of God.

<sup>Conc. Trul. Can. 80.</sup> Oportet enim Episcopos curis secularibus expeditis curam suorum agere populorum, nec Ecclesiis suis abesse diutius. P. Paschal. II. Ep. 22.

For Bishops ought to be disentangled from secular cares, and to take charge of their people, and not to be long absent from their Churches.

Even later Synods in more corrupt times, and in the declension of good Order, yet did prohibit this practice.

<sup>Præcipimus ne condu-</sup> Etitius ministris Ecclesiæ committantur, Et unaquæq; Ecclesia, cui facultas suppetit, proprium habeas Sacerdotem. Conc. Lat. 2. (sub Innoc. II.) Can. 10.

We injoin that Churches be not committed to hired Ministers, but that every Church, that is of ability, have its proper Priest.

<sup>Conc. Lat. 3. (sub Alexandro III.) cap. 13.</sup> Cum igitur Ecclesia vel Ecclesiasticum ministerium committi debuerit, talis ad hoc persona quaeratur, quæ reside in loco, Et curam ejus per seipsum valet exercere; quod si aliter fuerit actum, Et qui receperit, quod contra Sanctos Canones accepit, amittat.

Therefore when a Church or the Ecclesiastical Ministry be to be committed to any man, let such a person be sound out for this purpose, who can reside upon the place, and discharge the cure by himself: but if it prove otherwise, then let him who has received, lose that which he has taken contrary to the holy Canons.

Epiphanius therefore did well infer, that it was needful the Apostles

Πάλω ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅπως ἵκανοι ἐπὶ πλείοντων τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὅτι καὶ τῶν Πέτρῳ καὶ Παύλῳ, Ἐποσκοῦντες ἄλλους καθίστασθαι, διὰ τὸ πρὸς Ἀποστόλους πολλάκις ὅτι τὰς ἄλλας πατείδας τὸ πολεῖν σέλλεσθαι, διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ διδάσκειν καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀλλὰ Ἐποσκοῦντες ἔδ. Epiph. her. 27.

should constitute Bishops resident at Rome; It was (saith he) possible that the Apostles Peter and Paul yet surviving other Bishops should be constituted, because the Apostles often did take journeys into other Countries, for preaching Christ, but the City of Rome could not be without a Bishop.

9. If Saint Peter were Bishop of Rome, he thereby did offend against divers other good Ecclesiastical Rules, which either were in practice from the beginning, or at least the reason of them was always good, upon which the Church did afterward enact them; so that either he did ill in thwarting them, or the Church had done it in establishing them, so as to condemn his practice.



If a Bishop, despising the meanness of his City, seeks for the administration of a more eminent place, and upon any occasion whatsoever transfers himself to a greater people, he shall not only be driven out of another's See, but also lose his own.

These Laws were so indispensable, that in respect to them *Constantine M.* who much loved and honoured *Eusebius* (acknowledging him in the common judgment of the world deserving to be Bishop of the whole Church) did not like, that he should accept the Bishoprick of *Antioch*, to which he was invited; and commended his waving it, as an act not only consonant to the Ecclesiastical Canons, but acceptable to God, and agreeable to Apostolical Tradition; so little aware was the good Emperor, of Saint Peter being translated from *Antioch* to *Rome*.

Euseb. de  
Vit. Const.  
3. 61.

In regard to the same Law, *Gregory Nazianzene* (a person of so great worth, and who had deserved so highly of the Church at *Constantinople*) could not be permitted to retain his Bishoprick of that Church, to which

he had been call'd from that small one of *Sasima*: The Synod (saith *Sozomen*) observing the Ancient Laws, and the Ecclesiastical Rule, did receive his Bishoprick, from him being willingly offered, no-wise regarding the great merits of the person; the which

'Αλλ' ὁ μὲν ἡ πόλις ὅτι τὸν πτελεῖς ἰ-  
μὸς, καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὴν τὴν ἐν φιλαδέλφει-  
ᾳ ἡ πόλις παρ' ἐκόντων ἀπέλαμψε, μὴδὲν  
αἰδέσθων τὸ τῷ ἀνδρὶ παλαιότητων.  
Sozom. 7. 7.

Illud pra-  
sereea com-  
moneo di-  
lectionem  
vestram,

ne patiamini aliquam contra Statuta majorum nostrorum de Civitate alia ad aliam transducī, & desertis plebem  
sibi commissam, Sc. P. Damasi Epist. apud Holsten. p. 41. & R. Marc. 5. 21.

Moreover this I advise you, that out of your charity you would not suffer any one, against the Decrees of our Ancestors, to be removed from one City to another, and to forsake the people committed to his charge, &c.

We may indeed observe, that Pope *Pelagius II.* did excuse the translation of Bishops, by the example of Saint Peter; for whoever dareth to say (argueth he) that Saint Peter the Prince of the Apostles did not act well, when he changed his See from *Antioch* to *Rome*?

Quis enim unquam audeat dicere S. Pe-  
trum Apostolorum Principem non bene  
egisse, quando mutavit sedem de Antio-  
chia in Romanam? Pelag. II. Ep. 1.

But I think it more advisable to excuse Saint Peter from being Author of a practice, judged so irregular, by denying the matter of Fact laid to his charge.

Contra Ecclesiasticam dispositionem,  
contra Evangelicam legem, contra Insti-  
tutionis Catholicae unitatem— Cypr. Ep.  
44. (ut & Ep. 46, 52, 55, 58.)

Ὁ διχρησίας συγκαλὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησι-  
αστικῆς διατάξεως ἀλλότρευον. Soz. 4. 15.

Syn. Nic. Can. 8.

Cornelius apud Euseb. 6. 43.  
Cypr. Ep. 46. P. Innocentius apud So-  
zom. 8. 26. Opt. I. Cathedra una.

11. It was anciently deemed a very irregular thing, contrary (saith St. Cyprian) to the Ecclesiastical disposition, contrary to the Evangelical Law, contrary to the unity of Catholic Institution; a Symbol (saith another ancient Writer) of dissension, and disagreeable to Ecclesiastical Law; which therefore was condemned by the Synod of *Nice*, by Pope *Cornelius*, by Pope *Innocent I.* and others, that two Bishops should preside together in one City.

In reme-  
dium  
Schisma-  
tis. Hier.

This was condemned with good reason; for this on the Churches part would be a kind of spiritual Polygamy; this would render a Church a monster with two heads; this would destroy the end of Episcopacy, which is unity and prevention of Schisms.

But if Saint Peter was Bishop of *Rome*, this irregularity was committed; for the same Authority upon which Saint Peter's Episcopacy of *Rome* is built, doth also reckon Saint Paul Bishop of the same; the same Writers do make both Founders and Planters of the *Roman Church*, and the same call both Bishops of it; wherefore if Episcopacy be taken in



in a strict and proper sense, agreeable to this Controversy, that rule must needs be infringed thereby.

*Irenæus* saith, that the Roman Church was founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul; *Dionysius* of Corinth calleth it the plantation of Peter and Paul; *Epiphanius* saith, that Peter and Paul were first at Rome both Apostles and Bishops; so *Eusebius* implieth, saying, that P. Alexander derived a succession in the fifth place from Peter and Paul.

*Ecclesia. Iren. 3. 3. 3. 1.*

Τὸ ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου οὐτάειν — *Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. 2. 25.*

Ἐν Ῥώμῃ γέγονασιν πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ Ἐπίσκοποι. *Epiph. Her. 27.*

Πέμπτην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατέχον διαδοχὴν. *Euseb. 4. 1.*

Wherefore both of them were Roman Bishops, or neither of them: In reason and rule neither of them may be called so in a strict and proper sense; but in a larger and improper sense both might be so styled.

Indeed that Saint Paul was in some acception Bishop of Rome (that is, had a Supreme superintendence or inspection of it) is reasonable to affirm; because he did for a good time reside there, and during that residence could not but have the chief place, could be subject to no other; He (saith Saint Luke) did abide two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that entred in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things, which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

It may be enquired, if Saint Peter was Bishop of Rome, how he did become such? did our Lord appoint him such? did the Apostles all or any constitute him? did the people elect him? did he put himself into it? of none of these things there is any appearance, nor any probability. *Non constat.*

#### SUPPOSITION IV.

They affirm, That Saint Peter did continue Bishop of Rome after his translation, and was so at his decease.

Against which Assertions we may consider:

1. Ecclesiastical Writers do affirm, that Saint Peter (either alone, or together with Saint Paul) did constitute other Bishops; wherefore Saint Peter was never Bishop, or did not continue Bishop there.

*Irenæus* saith, that the Apostles founding and rearing that Church, delivered the Episcopal Office into the hands of Linus; if so, how did they retain it in their own hands or persons? could they give, and have?

*Tertullian* saith, that Saint Peter did ordain Clement.

Θεμελιώσαντες ἡν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, Λίνω τῷ Ἐπισκοπῷ λειτουργίαν ἐκτίθεισαν. *Iren. apud Euseb. 5. 6.*

*Romanorum Ecclesie Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit. Text. de Praef. 31.*

In the Apostolical Constitutions (a very ancient Book, and setting forth the most ancient Traditions of the Church,) the Apostles ordering

Ex quibus electum magnum plebique pro-  
batum,  
Hæc Cathedrâ, Petrus quâ federat ipse,  
locatam  
Maxima Roma Linum primum considere  
jussit.  
Tert. in Marc. 3.9.

Prayers to be made for all Bishops, and na-  
ming the principal, do reckon, not Saint Pe-  
ter, but Clement, Let us pray for our Bishop  
James, for our Bishop Clemens, for our Bishop Evo-  
dus, &c.

These reports are consistent, and reconciled by that which the Apo-  
stolical Constitutions affirm; that Linus was first ordained Bishop of the  
Roman Church by Paul; but Clemens after the death of Linus by Peter in  
the second place.

Ἡς δὲ Ρω-  
μαίων Ἐκ-  
κλησίας  
Ἀπὸ τοῦ  
Κλαυδίου  
τῆς Πρώτης  
ἑστῆς  
ἡμετέρας  
Κλήμης ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀνδρέου ὁ ἀδελφεὸς τοῦ Πέτρου ὁ ἀδελφεὸς τοῦ  
Ἰωάννου. Const. Apost. 7. 46.

Euseb. 3.4. 13. Aug Ep. 165.

Epiph. Her. 27. Opt. 2.

Tertull. poem. in Marc. 3.9.

Phot. Cod. 112. (p. 290.)

N. Eusebius (3.2.) saith, that Linus  
did sit Bishop after the Martyrdom of  
Saint Peter, but this is not so probable, as that which the Author of the Constitutions doth affirm, which recon-  
cileth the dissonancies of Writers.

Others between Linus and Clemens do inter-  
pose Cletus or Anacletus (some taking these for  
one, others for two persons) which doth not  
alter the case.

Now hence we may infer, both that Saint Peter never was Bi-  
shop; and upon supposition that he was, that he did not continue so.  
For,

2. If he had ever been Bishop, he could not well lay down his Office,  
or subrogate another, either to preside with him, or to succeed him;  
according to the ancient Rules of Discipline, and that which passed for  
right in the Primitive Church.

This practice Pope Innocent I. condemned, as irregular and never  
known before his time; We (saith he in his Epistle to the Clergy and

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ποῦποτε ἑστῆς τῆς πατρὸς τοῦ τα-  
πεινῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄλλος μὴ καὶ κα-  
λῶς, τῷ μνημῆτι εἰς τόπον ἑστῆς χει-  
ρὸς τοῦ Ἀποστόλου δεδωδῆς ἐξουσίας. P. Inn. I. a  
pud Soz. 8. 26.

People of Constantinople) never have known these  
things to have been adventured by our Fathers, but  
rather to have been hindered; for that none hath  
power given him to ordain another in the place of one  
living: He did not (it seems) consider, that  
Saint Peter had used such a power.

Accordingly the Synod of Antioch (to secure the tradition and pra-  
ctice of the Church, which began by some to be infringed) did make

Ἐποκότου μὴ ἔσθαι αὐτὸ ἰαντὴ καὶ δι-  
στασι ἑτέρου, καὶ οὐδὲ τῇ τελευτῇ οὐ βί-  
ου ἡμετέρας. Syn. Ant. Can. 23.

this Sanction, that it should not be lawful for any  
Bishop to constitute another in his room to succeed  
him; although it were at the point of death.

3. But supposing Saint Peter were Bishop once, yet by constituting  
Linus, or Clemens in his place, he ceased to be so, and divested himself  
of that place; for it had been a great irregularity for him to continue  
Bishop together with another.

That being, in St. Cyprian's judgment, the Ordination of Linus had

Cum post primum secundus esse non pos-  
sit; quisquis post unum, qui solus esse de-  
beat, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est.  
Cypri. Ep. 51.

been void and null; for seeing (saith that H. Mar-  
tyr) there cannot after the first be any second, who-  
ever is after one, who ought to be sole Bishop, he is  
not now second, but none.

Upon this ground, when the Emperor Constantius would have pro-  
cured Felix to sit Bishop of Rome together with Pope Liberius, at his re-  
turn from Banishment (after his compliance with the Arians) the  
people of Rome would not admit it, exclaiming One God, one Christ, one

Thod. hist. 2. 17.

Ταῦτα καὶ τῷ διὰ διακρίσεως, ὅτι τῷ  
Πέτρῳ δεῖσθαι μὴ ἀδελφεῖν καὶ τοῦ δευτέρου ἡμετέρας  
ἰθαυόμενον.

Bishop; and whereas Felix soon after that died,  
the Historian remarketh it as a special providence  
of God that Peter's Throne might not suffer infamy;  
being

being governed under two Prelates; he never considered, that Saint Peter and Saint Paul, Saint Peter and Linus had thus governed that same Church.

Upon this account St. Austin being assumed by Valerius with him to be Bishop of Hippo, did afterward discern and acknowledge his error.

*Adhuc in corpore posito beatorum memorie patris Episcopo meo sene Valerio Episcopus ordinatus sum, & sedi cum illo, quod concilio Niceno prohibitum fuisset, nesciebam, nec ipse sciebat. Aug. Ep. 110.*

While my Father and Bishop of blessed memory, old Valerius was yet living, I was ordained Bishop, and held the See with him: which I knew not, nor did he know, to be forbidden by the Council of Nice.

In fine, to obviate this practice, so many Canons of Councils (both general and particular) were made, which we before did mention.

4. In sum, when Saint Peter did ordain others (as story doth accord in affirming) either he did retain the Episcopacy, and then (beside need, reason and rule) there were concurrently divers Bishops of Rome at one time; or he did quite relinquish and finally divorce himself from the Office, so that he did not die Bishop of Rome, the which overturneth the main ground of the Romish pretence. Or will they say, that Saint Peter, having laid aside the Office for a time, did afterward before his death resume it? then what became of Linus, of Cletus, of Clemens? were they dispossessed of their place, or deposed from their function; would Saint Peter succeed them in it? this in Bellarmine's own judgment had been plainly intolerable.

5. To avoid all which difficulties in the case, and perplexities in story, it is reasonable to understand those of the Ancients, who call Peter Bishop of Rome, and Rome the place, the Chair, the See of Peter, as meaning that he was Bishop or Superintendent of that Church, in a large sense; because he did found the Church by converting men to the Christian Faith; because he did erect the Chair by ordaining the first Bishops; because he did in virtue both of his Apostolical Office, and his special Parental relation to that Church, maintain a particular inspection over it, when he was there: which notion is not new, for of old Rufinus affirmeth that he had it, not from his own invention, but from Tradition of others; Some (saith he) inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were Bishops in the City of Rome before Clement, Clement himself writing to James, could say that the See was delivered to him by Peter: whereof this reason has been given us, viz. that Linus and Cletus were indeed Bishops of Rome before Clement, but Peter being yet living, viz. that they might take the Episcopal charge, but he fulfill'd the Office of the Apostleship.

6. This notion may be confirmed by divers observations.

It is observable that the most ancient Writers, living nearest the fountains of Tradition, do not expressly style Saint Peter Bishop of Rome, but only say, that he did found that Church, instituting and ordaining Bishops there; as the other Apostles did in the Churches which they settled; so that the Bishops there in a large sense did succeed him, and deriving their power from his ordination, and supplying his room in the

*Ipse sublimavit Sedem, in qua etiam quiescere, & presentem vitam finire dignatus est. Greg. I. Ep. 6. 37. Innoc. I. Ep. 21. P. Nic. I. Ep. 9. p. 509. Grat. can. 8. q. 1. ca. 1.*

He advanced that See, wherein he vouchsafed both to set up his rest, and also to end this present life.

Bell 2. 12. § At verò —

*Petrus Apostolum successisse in Episcopatu Anacletus alius ex discipulis, quod est plane intolerandum. Bell 2. 6.*

*Quidam enim requirunt quomodo, cum Linus & Cletus in urbe Roma ante Clementem hunc fuerint Episcopi, ipse Clementem ad Jacobum scribens, sibi dicat à Petro docendi Cathedram traditam, cujus rei hanc accepimus esse rationem, quod Linus & Cletus fuerunt quidem ante Clementem Episcopi in urbe Roma, sed supersite Petro, videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse verò Apostolatus imple-ret officium. Rufin. in pref. ad Clem. Recogn.*

*Const. A. post. 7. 46. Iren. 3. 3. Tertull.*



*Fundantes igitur, & instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam Lino Episcopatum administrande Ecclesie tradiderunt. Iren.*

3. 3.

The Blessed Apostles therefore founding and instructing the Church, delivered the Episcopal power of ordering and governing the Church to Linus.

with the Roman Bishops, affecting by all means to reckon Saint Peter for their predecessor) did easily catch, and not well distinguishing did call him Bishop, and Saint Paul also, so making two Heads of one Church.

7. It is also observable, that in the recensions of the Roman Bishops, sometimes the Apostles are reckoned in, sometimes excluded.

*Euseb. 3. 4. 73. 15.*

*Iren. 3. 3.*

*Πρωτὸν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν διαδοχὴν. Euseb. 4. 1.*

*Iren. 1. 28. 3. 3. 4.*

*Euseb. 4. 10.*

The same difference in reckoning may be observed in other Churches; for instance, although Saint Peter is called no less Bishop of Antioch than

*Ἀντιοχείων ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπος Ἐυδίου ἐκκλησίας. Euseb. Chron. p. 7. Hist. 3. 32.*

*Μνημονεύει Ἐυδίου, ὃς πρῶτον ἐκκλησίας ἐξῆν καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὑμετέρων πρεσβυτέρων. Pseud. Ignat. ad Ant.*

*Euseb. counteth Annianus the first Bishop of Alexandria.*

Other instances may be seen in the Notes of Cotelierius upon the Apostolical Constitutions, where he maketh this general Observation.

*Celebris mos est Apostolos pro potestate eorum ordinaria vel extraordinaria, Episcopalis vel Apostolica, Indiculis anastirum præfigere, aut ex iis eximere. Cotel. Not. p. 299.*

'Tis an usual custom with the Apostles according to their Power ordinary or extraordinary, Episcopal or Apostolical, to prefix, &c. but it was needless to suppose these two Powers, when one was sufficient, it virtually containing the other.

This is an Argument that the Ancients were not assured in opinion; that the Apostles were Bishops; or that they did not esteem them Bishops in the same notion with others.

8. It is observable, that divers Churches did take denomination from the Apostles, and were called Apostolical Thrones,

*Apostolice Ecclesie. Tert. de Præscr. 32. Ἀποστολικαὶ θρόνοι. Soz. 1. 17.*

*2 Tim. 1. 6. In Canonicis auctoritatem Scrip-*

*turis Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sancte illa sunt, quæ Apostolicas sedes habere, & Epistolas accipere meruerunt. Aug. de doctr. Ch. 2. 8.*

Let him follow the Authority of those many Catholick Churches in the Canonical Scriptures, among which surely are those which had the honour to have Apostolical Sees, and to receive Epistles from the Apostles.

Proinde utique & cetera exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis erudices habent. Tertull. de Præscr. 32.

or Chairs, not because the Apostles themselves did sit Bishops there, but because they did exercise their Apostleship, in teaching; and in constituting Bishops there, who (as Tertullian saith) did propagate the Apostolical seed.

So was *Ephesus* esteemed, because *Saint Paul* did found it, and ordained *Timothy* there; and because *Saint John* did govern and appoint Bishops there.

*Sed & quæ est Ephesi Ecclesia à Paulo qui-*

*dem fundata, Johanne autem permanente apud eos usque ad Trajani tempora, &c. Iren. 3. 3.* And also the Church of *Ephesus* which was founded by *Saint Paul*, *Saint John* continuing with them till the time of *Trajan*, &c.

*Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensuit in Johannem stabit autorem. Tertull. in Marc. 4. 5.*

*Τὸν δὲ Ἐπίσκοπον Τίμοθεον ὁ Ἅγιος Παῦλος, ἑτάροισι τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσῷ ἑταίρων, Ἀποστ. Const. 7. 46.*

So was *Smyrna* accounted, because *Polycarpus* was settled there by the Apostles, or by *Saint John*.

*Ab Apostolis in ea quæ est*

*Smyrnis Ecclesia constitutus Episcopus. Iren. 3. 3. Smyrnenorum Ecclesia habens Polycarpum ab Johanne conlocatam. Tertull. de Prescr. 32. Euseb. 3. 36.*

*Τὴν καὶ Σμύρναν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ὑπαρχόντων τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν. Euseb. 3. 36.*

So *Cyril*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, had a controversy about metropolitanical Rights with *Acacius* Bishop of *Cæsarea*, as presiding in an Apostolical See.

*Πατρι- ἀρχιεπισκοπικῶν δικαι-*

*ον διακρίσεων καὶ Ἀκίλλου καὶ Καισαρείας, καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς δεξιότητος. Sozom. 4. 25.*

So *Alexandria* was deemed, because *Saint Mark* was supposed by the appointment of *Saint Peter* to sit there:

So were *Corinth*, *Theſſalonica*, *Philippi* called by *Tertullian*, because *Saint Paul* did found them, and furnish them with Pastors; in which respect peculiarly the Bishops of those places were called Successors of the Apostles:

*Tertull. de Prescr. 36.*

So *Constantinople* did assume the title of an Apostolical Church, probably because, according to tradition, *St. Andrew* did found that Church, although *Pope Leo I.* would not allow it that appellation.

*Ἀποστολικῆς καὶ τίτῳ δεξιότητος καὶ πατριάρχης.*

*Syn. Chal. A.D. 10. p. 379. p. 284. Thou desistest this Apostolical Throne. — Ἐπὶ τῷ καὶ πατριάρχῳ ἀποστολικῷ καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ. Niceph. 2. 9.*

Forasmuch as having appointed holy *Stachys* the first Bishop, in the Church which he first settled there.

*Non designetur regiam civitatem, quam Apostolicam non potest facere sedem — P. Leo I. Ep. 54.*

Let him not disdain the Royal City, which he cannot make an Apostolick See.

Upon the same account might *Rome* at first be called an Apostolical See; although afterward the *Roman* Bishops did rather pretend to that denomination, upon account of *Saint Peter* being Bishop there; and the like may be said of *Antioch*.

*Memento quia Apo-*

*stolicam sedem Regis — Greg. M. Ep. 4. 37. Remember you rule an Apostolick See.*

9. It is observable, that the Author of the Apostolical Constitutions, reciting the first Bishops constituted in several Churches, doth not reckon any of the Apostles; particularly not *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *John*.

*Const. A. post. 7. 46.*

10. Again, any Apostle wherever he did reside by virtue of his Apostolical Office, without any other designation or assumption of a more special Power, was qualified to preside there, exercising a Superintendency comprehensive of all Episcopal functions; so that it was needless, that he should take upon himself the character or style of a Bishop.

This (beside the tenour of ancient Doctrine) doth appear from the demeanour of *Saint John*, who never was reckoned Bishop of *Ephesus*; nor could be, without displacing *Timothy*, who by *Saint Paul* was constituted Bishop there, or succeeding in his room; yet he abiding at *Ephesus*,

*Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Τιμοθέου μέχρι νῦν καὶ ὁ ἀποστολικὸς ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία καὶ ἡ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία. Syn. Chal. A.D. 11. 2 Tim. 1. 6.*

From holy *Timothy* till now there have been seven and twenty Bishops, and all ordained at *Ephesus*.

*Johanne autem permanente apud eos, &c. Iren. 3. 3.*

did





and consequently the objection is grounded on an uncertainty.

2. Granting that Saint *James* was one of the Apostles (as some of the Ancients seem to think, calling him an Apostle; and as divers modern Divines conceive, grounding chiefly upon these words of Saint *Paul*, *But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's Brother*, and taking Apostles there in the strictest sense) I answer,

That the case was peculiar, and there doth appear a special reason, why one of the Apostles should be designed to make a constant residence at *Jerusalem*, and consequently to preside there like a Bishop. For *Jerusalem* was the *Metropolis*, the Fountain, the Centre of the Christian Religion, where it had birth, where was greatest matter and occasion of propagating the Gospel, most people disposed to embrace it resorting thither; where the Church was very numerous, consisting, as Saint *Luke* (or Saint *James* in him) doth intimate, of *divers myriads* <sup>Act. 21.</sup> of believing Jews; whence it might seem expedient, that a person of greatest Authority should be fixed there for the confirming and improving that Church, together with the propagation of Religion among the people, which resorted thither; the which might induce the Apostles to settle Saint *James* there, both for discharging the Office of an Apostle, and the supplying the room of a Bishop there.

According to him (saith *Eusebius*) *The Episcopal Throne was committed by the Apostles; or our Lord* (saith *Ephraïmus*) *did entrust him with his own Throne.*

*Hierosolymitanam, quam primus Apostolus Jacobus Episcopatu suo rexist.* Aug. c. Crefc. 2. 37.

The Church of Jerusalem, which James the Apostle first governed by his Episcopal power.

Gal. 1. 19.

ὁ πρῶτος τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὁ καὶ Ἐπισκοπὴς ἱεροσολύμων ἦν. Euseb. 2. 23.

ὁ πρῶτος καὶ Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῆς. Epiph. Her. 78.

But there was no need of fixing an Apostle at other places; nor doth it appear that any was so fixed; especially Saint *Peter* was incapable of such an employment, requiring settlement and constant attendance, who beside his general Apostleship, had a peculiar Apostleship of the dispersed Jews committed to him; who therefore was much engaged in travel for propagation of the Faith, and edifying his Converts every where.

3. The greater consent of the most ancient Writers making Saint *James* not to have been one of the twelve Apostles, it is thence accountable, why (as we before noted) Saint *James* was called by some ancient Writers, *the Bishop of Bishops*, *the Prince of Bishops*, &c. because he was the first Bishop, of the first See, the Mother Church; the Apostles being excluded from the comparison.

Upon these considerations we have great reason to refuse the assertion or scandal cast on Saint *Peter*, that he took on him to be Bishop of *Rome*, in a strict sense, as it is understood in this controversy.

**N**

**SUP.**

## SUPPOSITION V.

A farther Assertion is this, Superstructed by consequence on the former, That the Bishops of Rome, (according to God's Institution, and by original Right derived thence) should have an Universal Supremacy and Jurisdiction, (containing the privileges and prerogatives formerly described) over the Christian Church.

THIS Assertion to be very uncertain, yea to be most false, I shall by divers considerations evince.

1. If any of the former Suppositions be uncertain, or false, this Assertion, standing on those legs, must partake of those defects, and answerably be dubious, or false. If either Peter was not Monarch of the Apostles, or if his privileges were not successive, or if he were not properly Bishop of Rome at his decease, then farewell the Romish claim; if any of those things be dubious, it doth totter; if any of them doth prove false, then down it falleth.

But that each of them is false, hath I conceive been sufficiently declared; that all of them are uncertain; hath at least been made evident.

The Structure therefore cannot be firm, which relieth on such Props.

2. Even admitting all those Suppositions, the inference from them is not assuredly valid. For Saint Peter might have an Universal Jurisdiction, he might derive it by Succession, he might be Bishop of Rome; yet no such Authority might hence accrue to the Roman Bishop, his Successor in that See.

For that Universal Jurisdiction might be derived into another Chancel, and the Bishop of Rome might in other respects be Successor to him, without being so in this.

As for instance, in the Roman Empire, before any Rule of Succession was established therein, the Emperor was Sovereign Governor; and he might die Consul of Rome, having assumed that place to himself; yet when he died, the Supreme Authority did not lapse into the hands of the Consul, who succeeded him, but into the hands of the Senate, and People: his Consular Authority only going to his Successor in that Office. So might Saint Peter's Universal Power be transferred unto the Ecclesiastical College of Bishops, and of the Church; his Episcopal inferior Authority over the singular *παροικία*, or Province of Rome, being transmitted to his Followers in that Chair.

3. That in truth it was thus, and that all the Authority of Saint Peter, and of all other Apostles, was devolved to the Church, and to the representative Body thereof, the Fathers did suppose; affirming the Church to have received from our Lord a Sovereign Power.

*Hæc est una quæ tenet & possidet omnem sponsi sui & Domini potestatem, in hac præsidemus, pro honore ejus & unitate pugnamus.* Cypr. Ep. 73.

This (saith St. Cyprian) is that One Church, which holdeth and possesseth all the power of its Spouse and Lord, in this we preside; for the honour and unity of this we fight — saith he in his Epistle to Iulianus, wherein he doth impugn the proceedings

ceedings of Pope Stephanus; the which Sentence St. Austin appropriateth to himself, speaking it absolutely, without citing St. Cyprian. To this Authority of the Church, St. Basil would have all that confess the faith of Christ to submit; To which end we exceedingly need your assistance, that they who confess the Apostolick faith, would renounce the Schisms which they have devised, and submit themselves henceforth to the Authority of the Church.

They (after the Holy Scripture, which faith, that each Bishop hath a care of God's Church, and is obliged to feed the Church of God — and is appointed to edify the body of Christ) do suppose the administration of the Ecclesiastical Affairs concerning the publick state of the Church, the defence of the common Faith, the maintenance of Order, Peace and Unity jointly to belong unto the whole body of Pastors; according to that of St. Cyprian to Pope Stephanus himself, Therefore, most dear brother, the body of Priests is copious, being joined together by the glue of mutual concord, and the bond of unity, that if any of our College should attempt to make heresy, and to tear or waste the flock of Christ, the rest may come to succour; and like useful and merciful shepherds may recollect the sheep into the flock. And again, Which thing it concerns us to look after and redress, most dear brother, who bearing in mind the divine clemency, and holding the scales of the Church government, &c.

So even the Roman Clergy did acknowledge, For we ought all of us to watch for the body of the whole Church, whose members are digested through several Provinces.

Like the Trinity, whose power is one and undivided, there is one Priesthood among divers Bishops.

So in the Apostolical Constitutions, the Apostles tell the Bishops, that an universal Episcopacy is entrusted to them.

So the Council of Carthage with St. Cyprian — Clear and manifest is the mind and meaning of our Lord Jesus Christ, sending his Apostles, and affording to them alone the power given him of the Father; in whose room we succeeded, governing the Church of God with the same power.

Christ our Lord and our God going to the Father, commended his Spouse to us.

A very ancient Instance of which administration is the proceeding against Paulus Samosatenus; when the Pastors of the Churches, some from one place, some from another, did assemble together against him as a pest of Christ's flock, all of them hastening to Antioch; where they deposed, exterminated and deprived him of communion, warning the whole Church to reject and disavow him.

Ἐφ' ἧς καὶ μέγιστα τὴν παρ' ὑμῶν χάριν καὶ βοήθειαν, ὥστε τοὺς Ἀποστολικὴν ὁμολογούντας πίστιν, ἀπὸ ἐπινόητων, σχισμάτων διαλύσασθαι, ὑποταγῆναι τοῦ λοιποῦ τῇ αὐθιγῇ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Bas. Epist. 69.

Collegium Sacerdotum. Cyp. Ep. 67.  
Ἦν δὲ πῶτος Ἐπισκοπὸς τῆς ἑσθ' ἡ ἐξουσία. Apost. Const. 8. 10.

Idcirco enim, frater charissime, copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum, concordiae mutuae glutino atq; unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex Collegio nostro haeresin facere, & gregem Christi lacerare & vastare tentaverit, subveniant caeteri, & quasi Pastores utiles & misericordes oves Domini in gregem colligant. Cyp. Ep. 67.

Cui rei nostrum est consulere, & subvenire, frater charissime, qui divinam clementiam clementes, & gubernanda Ecclesiae libram tenentes, &c. Ibid.

Omnes enim nos decet pro corpore totius Ecclesiae, cujus per varias quasq; provincias membra digesta sunt, excubare. Cler. Rom. apud Cyp. Ep. 30.

Ad Trinitatis instar, cujus una est atq; individua potestas, unum esse per diversos Antistites Sacerdotem. P. Symmachus ad Aeonium Arelat.

Ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσι δίδωμεν. Const. Apost. 6. 14.

Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Apostolos suos mittentis, & ipsis solis potestatem à Petro sibi datam permissentis, quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernantes. Conc. Carth. apud Cyp. p. 405. j

Christus Dominus & Deus noster ad Patrem proficiscens, sponsam suam nobis commendavit. Ibid. p. 404.

Οἱ λοιποὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ποιῶντες ἄλλοι ἄλλοθεν εἰς ὅτι λυμῶνα τῆς χριστοῦ ποιμνῆς (καίτοι οἱ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ Ἀγίᾳ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ) Euseb. 7. 27.



*Cum communis sit omnibus* Seeing the Pastoral charge is common to us all, who bear the Episcopal Office, although thou sittest in a higher and more eminent place.  
*1. o. 11.* qui fungimur Episcopatus officio, quamvis ipse in eo præmineas celsiore fastigio, specula pastoralis — Aug. ad Bonif. contra duas Epist. Pelag. 1. 1.

*Hujus ergo rei gratia vobis et nobis sancta* Therefore for this cause the Holy Church is committed to you and to us, that we may labour for all, and not be slack in yielding help and assistance to all.  
*sancta commissa est Ecclesia, ut pro omnibus laboremus, et cunctis opem ferre non negligamus — P. Joh. 1. Ep. 1. (ad Zachar.) apud Bin. Tom. 3. p. 812.*

*Kai ὅς ἡν πεπαιδευμένον καλῶς παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος χάριτος, ὅτι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας περιεσώτα καὶ ἐκείνης μόνος ἀνδρὶς δὲ τῆς παρὰ τῷ πνεύματι ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι καὶ οἰκουμένην κερμαῖς.* Chryl. Tom. 3. Or. 93.

*A corpore nostri, et Sacerdotis consensione discesseris — Cypr. Ep. 67.*  
*Qui se ab Ecclesie vinculo, atque a Sacerdotum Collegio separat.* Cypr. Ep. 52.

*Αὐτὸς σὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ τῶν κερτῶν τῶν γῆς ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων μετῴκηκεν* Basil. Ep. 56.

They took themselves all to be Vicars of Christ, and Judges in his

*Neque enim aliunde Hæreses oborta sunt, aut nata sunt Schismata, quàm inde quoddam Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperetur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos, et ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur.* Cypr. Ep. 55.

Church is meant any particular Church, and by Priest a Bishop of such Church, any one not bewitched with prejudice by the tenour of St. Cyprian's discourse will easily discern.

*Christi et Vicarius Domini est.* Ambr. in 1 Cor. 11. The Bishop sustains the Person of Christ, and is the Vicar of our Lord.

*Cypr. Ep. 27.* They conceive that our Saviour did promise to Saint Peter the Keys in behalf of the Church, and as representing it.

They suppose the combination of Bishops in peaceable consent and mutual aid, to be the Rock on which the Church is built.

They alledge the Authority granted to Saint Peter as a ground of claim to the same in all Bishops jointly, and in each Bishop singly, according to his *rata pars*, or allotted proportion.

*Quod ex verbis Domini faciliè intelligi potest, quibus P. Petro, cuius vicem Episcopi gerunt, ait Quodcumque, &c.*  
*Capit. Caroli M. lib. 5 cap. 163.*  
*Ego Constantini, vos Petri gladium habetis in manibus.*

Hence St. Chrysostom said of Eustathius his Bishop; For he was well instructed and taught by the grace of the Holy Spirit, that a President or Bishop of a Church ought not to take care of that Church alone, wherewith he is intrusted by the Holy Ghost, but also of the whole Church dispersed throughout the world.

They consequently did repute Schism, or Ecclesiastical Rebellion, to consist in a departure from the consent of the body of the Priesthood, as St. Cyprian in divers places doth express it, in his Epistles to Pope Stephen, and others.

They deem all Bishops to partake of the Apostolical Authority, according to that of St. Basil to St. Ambrose; the Lord himself hath translated thee from the Judges of the Earth unto the Prelacy of the Apostles.

They took themselves all to be Vicars of Christ, and Judges in his stead; according to that of St. Cyprian; For Heresies are sprung up, and Schisms grown from no other ground nor root but this, because God's Priest was not obeyed, nor was there one Priest or Bishop for a time in the Church, nor a Judge thought on for a time to supply the room of Christ. Where that by

Church is meant any particular Church, and by Priest a Bishop of such Church, any one not bewitched with prejudice by the tenour of St. Cyprian's discourse will easily discern.

*Christi et Vicarius Domini est.* Ambr. in 1 Cor. 11. The Bishop sustains the Person of Christ, and is the Vicar of our Lord.

*Cypr. Ep. 27.* They conceive that our Saviour did promise to Saint Peter the Keys in behalf of the Church, and as representing it.

They suppose the combination of Bishops in peaceable consent and mutual aid, to be the Rock on which the Church is built.

They alledge the Authority granted to Saint Peter as a ground of claim to the same in all Bishops jointly, and in each Bishop singly, according to his *rata pars*, or allotted proportion.

Which may easily be understood by the words of our Lord, when he says to blessed Peter, whose place the Bishops supply, Whatsoever, &c.

I have the sword of Constantine in my hands, you of Peter, said our great King Edgar.

They

They do therefore in this regard take themselves all to be Successors of Saint *Peter*, that his power is derived to them all, and that the whole Episcopal Order is the Chair by the Lord's voice founded on Saint *Peter*; thus St. *Cyprian* in divers places (before touched) discourseth; and thus *Firmilian* from the Keys granted to Saint *Peter* inferreth, disputing against the Roman Bishop; Therefore (saith he) the power of remitting sins is given to the Apostles, and to the Churches, which they being sent from Christ did constitute, and to the Bishops, which do succeed them by vicarious ordination.

Potestas ergo remittendorum peccatorum Apostolis data est, & Ecclesiis quas illi à Christo missi constituerunt, & Episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicariâ succedunt. Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.

4. The Bishops of any other Churches founded by the Apostles, in the Fathers style are Successors of the Apostles, in the same sense, and to the same intent as the Bishop of *Rome* is by them accounted Successor of Saint *Peter*; the Apostolical power, which in extent was universal, being in some sense, in reference to them, not quite extinct, but transmitted by succession; yet the Bishops of Apostolical Churches did never claim, nor allowedly exercise Apostolical Jurisdiction, beyond their own precincts; according to those words of St. *Hierom*, Tell me, what doth *Palestine* belong to the Bishop of *Alexandria*?

Responde mihi, ad Alexandrinum Episcopum Palestina quid pertinet? Hier. ad Pammach. Ep. 61. 15.

This sheweth the inconsequence of their discourse; for in like manner the Pope might be Successor to Saint *Peter*, and Saint *Peter's* universal power might be successive, yet the Pope have no singular claim thereto, beyond the bounds of his particular Church.

5. So again, for instance, Saint *James* (whom the *Roman* Church, in her Liturgies, doth avow for an Apostle,) was Bishop of *Jerusalem* more unquestionably, than Saint *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*; *Jerusalem* also was the root, and the mother of all Churches, (as the Fathers of the Second General Synod, in their Letter to Pope *Damasus* himself, and the Occidental Bishops did call it, forgetting the singular pretence of *Rome* to that Title.)

Τῆς ἡ μητρὸς ἀποστολῆς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ἡ ἱερουσόλυμα. Theodor. 5. 9.  
Mater Christiani nominis Imper. Just. ad P. Hormisd. apud Bin. Tom. 3. p. 794.  
The mother of the Christian name.

Yet the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, Successors of Saint *James*, did not thence claim I know not what kind of extensive Jurisdiction; yea notwithstanding their succession they did not so much as obtain a metropolitical Authority in *Palestine*, which did belong to *Cæsarea* (having been assigned thereto, in conformity to the Civil Government) and was by special provision reserved thereto in the Synod of *Nice*; whence St. *Jerom* did not stick to affirm, that the Bishop of *Jerusalem* was subject to the Bishop of *Cæsarea*; for speaking to John Bishop of *Jerusalem*, who for compurgation of himself from errors imputed to him had appealed to *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, he saith, Thou hadst rather cause molestation to ears possessed, than render honour to thy Metropolitian; that is, to the Bishop of *Cæsarea*.

Τὴ μητρόλει παροράμεν τὴ οἰκίαν ἀξιωματ. Conc. Nic. Can. 7.  
Ibi decernitur, ut Palestina metropolis Cæsarea sit. Hier. Ep. 61. 15.  
Tis there decreed that Cæsarea should be the metropolis of Palestine.

Maluisti occupatis auribus molestias facere, quam debitorum metropolitano tuo honorem reddere. Hier. ad Pammach. Ep. 61. 15.

By which instance we may discern, what little consideration sometimes was had of personal or topical succession to the Apostles

in

in determining the extent of Jurisdiction, and why should the Roman Bishop upon that score pretend more validity than others?

Hier. ad Galat. 2. P. Pelag. II. Ep. 1.

—Ὁρὸν τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ μεγαλοπλευρῶς.  
τῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ. Syn. Chalced. Act. 7. p. 264.

6. Saint Peter probably e'er that he came at Rome did found divers other Churches, whereof he was paramount Bishop, or did retain a special superintendency over them; particularly *Antioch* was anciently called his See, and he is acknowledged to have sat there seven years, before he was Bishop of Rome.

Why therefore may not the Bishop of *Antioch* pretend to succeed Saint Peter in his universal Pastorship as well as his younger brother of Rome? why should Evodius ordained by Saint Peter at *Antioch*, yield to Clemens afterward by him ordained at Rome?

Act. 11. 26.

Πρεσβυτάριον καὶ ἕρκος Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Theod. 5. 9.

Ubi Imperator, ibi Roma.

Where the Emperor is, there is Rome.

*Antioch* was the first-born of Gentile Churches, where the name of Christians was first heard; *Antioch* was (as the Constantinopolitan Fathers called it) the most ancient and truly Apostolical Church.

*Antioch* by virtue of Saint Peter's sitting there, or peculiar relation to it, was (according to their own conceits) the principal See.

Why therefore should Saint Peter be so unkind to it, as not only to relinquish it, but to debase it; not only transferring his See from it, but divesting it of the privilege, which it had got?

Why should he prefer before it the City of Rome, the mystical Babylon, the mother of abominations of the earth, the Throne of Satan's Empire, the place which did then most persecute the Christian Faith; and Apo. 17. 6. was drunk with the blood of the Saints?

Sic & Ba-

bylon apud Joannem nostrum Romana Urbis figura est, proinde & magna & regno superba, & sanctorum debellatrix. Tertull. adv. Jud. cap. 9.

So also Babylon in our Saint John is a type of the City of Rome, and therefore of a great, royal, and proud City, and a subduer of the Saints.

Bell. 2. 12.

Potnisset Petrus nullam se-

dem particularem sibi unquam eligere, sicut fecit primus quinq; annis—*Ibid.* Peter might have chosen to himself no particular City; as he did the first five years.

7. The ground of this preference was, say they, Saint Peter's Will; and they have reason to say so, for otherwise if Saint Peter had died intestate, the Elder Son of *Antioch* would have had the best right to all his goods and dignities.

But how doth that Will appear? in what Tables was it written? in what Registers is it extant? in whose presence did he nuncupate it? it is no where to be seen or heard of.

Neither do they otherwise know of it, than by reasoning it out; and in effect they say only that it was fit he should will it, but they may be mistaken in their divinations; and perhaps notwithstanding them Saint Peter might Will as well to his former See of *Antioch*, as to his latter of Rome.

Jubente Domino, 2. 1.  
Deus ipse jussit Romæ figi Apostolicam Petri sedem 4. 4.

8. Indeed Bellarmine sometimes positively and briskly enough doth affirm, that God did command Saint Peter to fix his See at Rome; but his proofs of it are so ridiculously fond and weak, that I grudge the trouble of reciting them; and he himself sufficiently confuteth them, by saying



saying otherwhere, *It is not improbable, that our Lord gave an expresse command, that Peter should so fix his See at Rome, that the Bishop of Rome should absolutely succeed him.*

*Non est improbabile Dominum etiam aperte jussisse, ut sedem suam Petrus ita fixaret Rome, ut Romanus Episcopus absolute ei succederet. Bell. 2. 12. § Et quoniam.*

He saith it is not improbable; if it be no more than so, it is uncertain; it may be a mere conjecture or a dream.

It is much more not-unprobable that if God had commanded it, there would have been some assurance of a command so very important.

9. *Antioch* hath at least a fair plea for a share in Saint *Peter's* Prerogatives; for it did ever hold the repute of an Apostolical Church, and upon that score some deference was paid to it; why so, if Saint *Peter* did carry his See with all its Prerogatives to another place? But if he carried with him only part of his Prerogative, leaving some part behind at *Antioch*, how much then I pray did he leave there? why did he divide unequally, or leave less than half? if perchance he did leave half, the Bishop of *Antioch* is equal to him of *Rome*.

10. Other persons also may be found, who according to equal judgment might have a better title to the succession of *Peter* in his Universal Authority than the Pope; having a nearer relation to him than he, (although his Successor in one charge) or upon other equitable grounds.

For instance, Saint *John*, or any other Apostle, who did survive Saint *Peter*; for if Saint *Peter* was the Father of Christians, (which Title yet our Saviour forbiddeth any one to assume) Saint *John* might well claim to be his eldest Son; and it had been a very hard case for him to have been postponed in the succession; it had been a derogation to our Lord's own choice, a neglect of his special affection, a disparagement of the Apostolical Office for him to be subjected to any other; neither could any other pretend to the like gifts for management of that great charge.

11. The Bishop of *Jerusalem* might with much reason have put in his claim thereto, as being Successor of our Lord himself, who unquestionably was the High-priest of our Profession, and Archbishop of all our Souls; whose See was the Mother of all Churches; wherein Saint *Peter* himself did at first reside, exercising his Vicarship: If our Lord, upon special accounts out of course had put the Sovereignty into Saint *Peter's* hands, yet after his decease it might be fit, that it should return into its proper chapel.

This may seem to have been the judgment of the times, when the Author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* did write, who reporteth the Apostles to have ordered Prayers to be made first for *James*, then for *Clement*, then for *Evochim*.

12. Equity would rather have required, that one should by common consent and election of the whole Church be placed in Saint *Peter's* room, than that the Bishop of *Rome*, by election of a few Persons there, should succeed into it.

As the whole body of Pastors was highly concerned in that Succession, so it was reasonable that all of them should concur in designation of a Person thereto; it is not reasonable, to suppose, that either God would institute, or Saint *Peter* by will should devise a course of proceeding in such a case, so unequal and unsatisfactory.

If therefore the Church considering this equity of the case, together with the expediency of affairs in relation to its good, should undertake

to chuse for its self another Monarch, (the Bishop of another See, who should seem fitter for the place) to succeed into the prerogatives of *Saint Peter*, that Person would have a fairer title to that Office than the Pope; for such a Person would have a real title, grounded on some reason of the case; whereas the Pope's pretence doth only stand upon a positive Institution, whereof he cannot exhibit any Certificate: This was the mind of a great man among themselves; who saith, that *if possibly, the Bishop of Triers should be chosen for Head of the Church. For the Church has free power to provide it self a Head.*

*Quod si per possibile, Treverensis eligatur pro Capite Ecclesie. Habet enim Ecclesia potestatem liberam sibi de Capite providendi* — Card. Cus. de Conc. Cath. 2. 13. —

*Nam posuisset Petrus nullam sedem particularem sibi unquam eligere, sicut fecit primis quinque annis, & tunc moriente Petro, non Episcopus Romanus, neque Antiochenus successisset, sed is quem Ecclesia sibi elegeret.* Bell. 2. 12.

for it self. Now if the Church upon that supposition would have had such a right, it is not probable, that *Saint Peter* by his fact would have deprived it thereof or willingly done any thing in prejudice to it; there being apparently so much equity, that the Church should have a stroke in designation of its Pastor.

In ancient times there was not any small Church, which had not a suffrage in the choice of its Pastor; and was it fitting that all the Church should have one imposed on it without its consent?

*Nulla ratio finit ut inter Epi-*

*scopos habeantur, qui nec à Clericis sunt electi, nec à plebis expensis, nec à comprovincialibus Episcopis cum Metropolitano iudicio consecrati.* P. Leo I. Ep. 92.

No reason will admit, that they should be esteemed Bishops; who are neither chosen by the Clergy, nor desired by the People, nor consecrated by the Bishops of the same Province, with the consent of the Metropolitan.

*Nullus in viciis deus Episcopus: Cleri, plebs, & ordinis consensus requiratur.* — P. Celest. I. Ep. 2. Grat. dist. 61. cap. 13.

Let there be no Bishop imposed on any against their wills: Let the consent of the Clergy and People, and his own Order be required.

If we consider the manner in ancient time of electing and constituting the *Roman Bishop*, we may thence discern not only the improbability, but iniquity of this pretence: how was he then chosen? was it by a General Synod of Bishops, or by Delegates from all parts of Christendom, whereby the common interest in him might appear; and whereby the World might be satisfied that one was elected fit for that high Office? No; he was chosen, as usually then other particular Bishops were, by the Clergy and People of *Rome*; none of the World being conscious of the proceeding, or bearing any share therein.

Now, was it equal that such a power of imposing a Sovereign on all the grave Bishops, and on all the good People of the Christian world, should be granted to one City?

Was it fitting, that such a charge, importing advancement above all Pastors, and being entrusted with the welfare of all Souls in *Christendom*, should be the result of an election liable to so many defects and corruptions? which assuredly often, if not almost constantly, would be procured by ambition, bribery or partiality, would be managed by popular faction and tumults.

*Οὐδ' ἂν ἀνεῖται πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς ἡγεμενεῖς, ὥστε τὸ ἀποκρίνω πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς ἡγεμενεῖς.* Naz. Or. 20. p. 335.

It was observed generally of such Elections by *Nazienzen*, that Prelacies were not rather by virtue than by naughtiness; and that Episcopal Thrones did not rather belong to the more worthy, than to the more powerful.

And

And declaring his mind or wish that Elections of Bishops should rest only or chiefly in the best men; not in the wealthiest and mightiest; or in the impetuosity and unreasonableness of the people, and among them in those who are most easily bought and bribed; whereby he intimateth the common practice, and subjoineth; but now I can hardly avoid thinking, that the popular (or civil) governments are better ordered than ours, which are reputed to have divine grace attending them.

And that the Roman Elections in that time were come into that course, we may see by the relation and reflections of an honest Pagan Historian concerning the Election of Pope Damasus (contemporary of Gregory Nazianzen) Damasus (saith he) and Ursinus, above humane measure burning with desire to snatch the Episcopal See, did with divided parties most fiercely conflict; in which conflict upon one day in the very Church 130 Persons were slain; so did that great Pope get into the Chair; thus (as the Historian reflecteth) the wealth and pomp of the place naturally did provoke ambition by all means to seek it, and did cause fierce contentions to arise in the choice; whence commonly, wise and modest persons being excluded from any capacity thereof, any ambitious and cunning man, who had the art or the luck to please the multitude would by violence obtain it; which was a goodly way of constituting a Sovereign to the Church.

Thus it went within three ages after our Lord; and afterwards in the declensions of Christian simplicity and integrity matters were not like to be mended; but did indeed rather grow worse; as beside the reports and complaints of Historians, how that commonly by ambitious pretensions, by Simoniackal corruptions, by political bandyings, by popular factions, by all kinds of sinister ways, men crept into the place, doth appear by those many dismal Schisms, which gave the Church many pretended Heads, but not one certain one: as also by the result of them, being the choice of persons very unworthy and horribly flagitious.

*Eo enim tum Pontificatus devenerat, ut qui plus largitione & ambitione, non dico sanctitate vitæ & doctrinâ valeret, ut tunc modo dignitatis gradum bonis oppressis & a rejectis obtineret; quem morem utinam aliquando non retinissent nostra tempora.* Plat. in Silv.

For the business of the Papacy was come to that pass, that whoever by bribery and ambition, I say not, by holiness of life and learning, got the start of others, he alone obtained that degree of dignity, good men in the mean being depressed and rejected; which custom I would to God our times had not retained.

*Cum jam eo devenissent Ecclesiastici, ut non coacti ut antea, sed sponte & largitionibus Pontificium munus obirent.* Plat. in Steph. 6. Baron. Anno 112. § 8.

Whenas now Ecclesiastical persons are come to that pass, that they execute the Papal Office, not being compelled unto it, as heretofore, but of their own accord, and by bribing for it.

*Videbat enim Imperator eo licentia factiosum quemque & potentem, quamvis ignobilem devenisse, ut corruptis suffragiis tantam dignitatem consequeretur.* &c. Plat. in Clem. 2. (p. 313.)

For the Emperour saw, that every factious and powerful person, though base and ignoble, was grown to that height of licentiousness, that he obtained so great Dignity by corruption and buying of Suffrages.

*Omne Papale negotium munus agunt: quem dabis mihi de tota maxima Urbe, qui te in Papam receperit, pretio seu spe pretii non interveniente?* Bern. de Confid. 4. 2.

The whole business of making a Pope is managed by gifts: whom can you shew me in all this great City, who took you into the Papacy, without being bribed and corrupted with reward, or at least with hope of it?

*Ἐφ' οἷς ἔδωκε τὰς τοιαύτας περιβολὰς καὶ δαίμονι. ἢ ὅτι μάλιστα. — ἀλλὰ μὴ τοῖς εὐπορωτάτοις τε καὶ δυνατοτάτοις, ἢ πορῶν δόλῳ καὶ ἀλογία, καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μάλιστα τοῖς εὐνοητάτοις ἢ ὅτι κινδυνώσω τὰς δημοσίας ἀρχὰς εὐτακτοτέρας ὑπερλαμβάνων ἢ ἡμετέρων, αἷς ἢ δόλῳ χρεὶς ἐπισημίζω.* Greg. Naz. Or. 19. p. 211.

*Damasus Ursinus supra humanum modum ad rapiendam Episcopalem sedem ardentius scissis studiis acerrime conflictabantur*—Am. Marcell. lib. 27.

Sczom. 6. 23.

*N. que ego ab uno ostentationem rerum considerans urbanarum, hujus rei cupidus, &c. Id. Ibid.*

*Damasus II — Pontificatum per vim occupat, nullo Cleri populi que consensu; Ad eo enim inoleverat hic mos, ut jam cuique ambizioso liceret Petri sedem invadere.* Plat. (p. 314.)

Damasus II. invades the Popedom by force, without any consent of the Clergy and People; For so was it now grown into custom, that any ambitious man might invade Peter's See.



If it be said, that the Election of a Pope in old times was wont to be approved by the consent of all Bishops in the World, according to the testimony of St. Cyprian, who saith of Cornelius, that he was known by the testimony of his fellow-Bishops whose whole number through all the World did with peaceful unanimity consent.

—co-Episcoporum testimonio, quorum numerus universus per totum mundum concordis unanimitate consensit—Cypr. Ep. 52.

Cum Fabiani locus, id est cum locus Petri, & gradus Cathedrae sacerdotalis vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate atque omnium nostrum consensione. —Ibid.

When Fabianus's place, (i. e.) when the place of Peter, and the degree of the Sacerdotal Chair was vacant; which being obtained by the will of God, and all our consents.

I answer, that this consent was not in the Election, or antecedently to it; that it was only by Letters or Messages declaring the Election, according to that of St. Cyprian; that it was not any wise peculiar to the Roman Bishop, but such as was yielded to all Catholick Bishops, each of whom was to be approved, as St. Cyprian saith, by the testimony and judgment of his Collegues; that it was in order

Satis erat ut tute Episcopum factum Literis nunciaret, &c. Cypr. Ep. 42.

It was enough that you declared by Letters that you were made Bishop.

Episcopo semel facto, & Collegarum ac plebis testimonio & iudicio comprobato—Cypr. Ep. 41.

only to the maintaining fraternal communion and correspondence, signifying that such a Bishop was duly elected by his Clergy and People, was rightly ordained by his neighbour Bishops, did profess the Catholick Faith, and was therefore qualified for communion with his Brethren, such a consent to the election of any Bishop of old was given, (especially upon occasion, and when any question concerning the right of a Bishop did intervene) whereof now in the Election of a Pope no footstep doth remain.

Euseb.

We may also note, that the Election of Cornelius being contested, he did more solemnly acquaint all the Bishops of the World with his case, and so did obtain their approbation, in a way more than ordinary.

13. If God had designed this derivation of Universal Sovereignty, it is probable, that he would have prescribed some certain, standing, immutable way of Election; and imparted the right to certain Persons, and not left it at such uncertainty to the chances of time, so that the manner of Election hath often changed, and the power of it tossed into divers hands.

Et licet diversis temporibus diversi modi super Electione Romanorum Pontificum observati sunt, prout necessitas, & utilitas Ecclesiae exposcebat—Conc. Bas. Sess. 37. p. 98. Vide Grat. dist. 63. per tot.

And though in several times there have been observed several ways as to the Election of the Roman Pontiffs, according as the necessity and expediency of the Church required.

Of old it was (as other Elections) managed by nomination of the Clergy, and suffrage of the People.

Afterward the Emperours did assume to themselves the nomination, or approbation of them.

Nisi enim sum à clero in eligendo Pontifice actum erat, nisi ejus Electionem Imperator approbasset. Plat. in Pelag. II.

For then nothing was done by the Clergy in the choice of the Pope, unless the Emperor had approv'd his Election.

Is autem, But he, seeing the Princes consent was required, sent Messengers with Letters, cum Prin- to intreat Mauritius, that he would not suffer the Election made by the Clergy cipis con- and People of Rome in that case to be valid. sensus re- quisreretur,

nuncios cum Literis miserat, qui Mauritium obsecrarent, ne pateretur electionem Cleri & Populi Romani ea in re valere. Plat. in Greg. M. Vid. Grat. dist. 63.

Leo VIII. being tired out with the inconstancy of the Romans, transferred the whole power and authority of choosing the Pope from the Clergy and People of Rome, to the Emperour.

*Conc. Tom. 7. p. 182. Romano-rum in-*  
*constantiam pertæsus, Auctoritatem omnem eligendi Pontificis à Clero, Populoque Romano ad Imperatorem tran-*  
*stulit. Plat. in Leo VIII. (p. 291.)*

At some times the Clergy had no hand in the Election; but Popes were intruded by powerful Men or Women at their pleasure.

*Nusquam Cleri eligentis, vel*

*postea consentientis aliqua mentio. Baron. Anno 1112. § 8. Anno 1311. §. 1. There was nowhere any mention of the Clergy electing, or afterward consenting.*

Afterwards the Cardinals (that is, some of the chief Roman Clergy) did appropriate the Election to themselves; by the Decree of Pope Nicolas II. in his Lateran Synod.

*Grat. dist. 23. cap. 1. Plat. in Nic. II.*

Sometimes, out of course, general Synods did assume the Choice to themselves: as at Constance, Pisa and Basil.

14. From the Premises to conclude the Pope's Title to Saint Peter's Authority, it is requisite to shew the Power demised by him to be according to God's institution and intent, immutable and indefectible; for Power built upon the like, but far more certain principles hath in course of times, and by worldly changes been quite lost, or conveyed into other Channels, than those, wherein it was first put; and that irrecoverably, so that it cannot any-wise be retrieved, or reduced into the first order.

For instance, Adam was by God constituted Universal Sovereign of Mankind; and into that Power his eldest Son of right did succeed; and so it of right should have been continually propagated.

Yet soon did that Power fail, or was diverted into other courses; the World being cantonized into several Dominions; so that the Heir at Law among all the descendents of Adam cannot so easily be found, as a Needle in a Bottle of Hay, he probably is a Subject, and perhaps is a Peasant.

So might Saint Peter be Monarch of the Church, and the Pope might succeed him, yet by revolutions of things, by several defaults and incapacities in himself, by divers obstructions incident, by forfeiture upon encroaching on other mens rights, according to that *Maxime* of a great Pope, *He loseth his own, who coveteth more than his due*, his Power might be clipped, might be transplanted, might utterly decay and fail; to such fatalities other Powers are subject; nor can that of the Pope be exempt from them, as other where we shall more largely declare.

*Propria perdit qui indebita concupiscit. P. Leo I. Ep. 54.*

15. Indeed that God did intend his Church should perpetually subsist united in any one political frame of Government, is a principle, which they do assume, and build upon, but can no-wise prove. Nor indeed is it true. For,

If the Unity of the Church designed and instituted by God were only an Unity of Faith, of Charity, of Peace, of fraternal Communion and Correspondence between particular Societies and Pastours, then in vain it is to seek for the Subject and Seat of Universal Jurisdiction; now that God did not intend any other Unity, than such as those specified, we have good reason to judge, and shall we hope elsewhere sufficiently prove.

16. We may consider, that really the Sovereign Power (such as it is pretended) hath often failed, there having been for long spaces of time

no Roman Bishops at all, upon several accounts; which is a sign that the Church may subsist without it.

As, 1. When *Rome* was desolated by the *Goths*, *Vandals* and *Lombards*.  
*Vide Bern. Ep. 242, 243.* 2. In times, when the *Romans* would not suffer Popes to live with them.  
*Bell. 4.* 3. In case of discontinuance from *Rome*, when the Popes (so calling themselves) did for above seventy years abide in *France*; when they indeed, not being chosen by the *Roman* People, nor exercising Pastoral care over them, were only titular, not real Bishops of *Rome*; (They were Popes of *Avignon*, not of *Rome*; and Successors of God knows who, not of Saint *Peter*) no more than one continually living in *England* can be Bishop of *Jerusalem*.

4. In times of many long Schisms (22 Schisms) when either there was no true Pope, or which in effect was the same, no certain one.

5. When Popes were intruded by violence, whom *Baronius* himself positively affirmeth to have been no Popes: how then could a Succession of true Popes be continued from them, by the Clergy, which they in virtue of their Papal Authority did pretend to create?

6. When Elections had a flaw in them, were uncanonical and so null.  
 7. When Popes were Simoniacally chosen; who by their own Rules and Laws are no true Popes; being Hereticks, Heresiarchs.

*P. Greg. VII. Ep. 3. 7.*  
*P. Jul. in Conc. Lat. Sess. 5. p. 57.* Non solum hujusmodi Electio vel assumptio eo ipso nulla existat — &c.  
*Vide sup. §. 12.*

Such an Election or Assumption, let it not only be upon that account void and null.

The which was done for long courses of time very commonly, and in a manner constantly.

*Vide quæ- so quan- sum isti degeneraverint à majoribus suis; Illi enim upote viri Sanctissimi Dignitatem ultra oblatam contemnebant, orationi & Doctrina Christiana vacantes; hi vero largitione & ambitione Pontificatum querentes, & adepti, posthabito divino cultu, &c.* Plat. in Serg. 3. (p. 279.) Vid. — in Bened. IV. p. 277.

See, I beseech you, how much they have degenerated from their Ancestours; For they as being very Holy men did condemn that Dignity when freely offered, giving themselves wholly to Prayer and the Doctrine of Christ; but these by bribery and ambition seek and obtain the Papacy.

8. When Popes have been deposed; (as some by the Emperours, others by General Councils) in which case, according to Papal Principles, the Successours were illegal; for the Pope being Sovereign, he could not be judged or deposed; and his Successour is an Usurper.

9. When Popes where Heretical, that is (say they) no Popes.

10. When Atheists, Sorcerers, —

*Plat. in Joh. 10. (p. 275.)* Pontifices ipsi à Petri vestigiis discesserant. The Popes had swerv'd from the Examples of Peter. Possessor male fidei nullo tempore non prescribit. Reg. Jur. 2. in Sexto.  
 Elections in some of these cases being null, and therefore the Acts consequent to them invalid, there is probably a defailance of right continued to posterity.

He that has no right to the thing he possesses, cannot prescribe or plead any length of time to make his possession lawful.

And probably therefore there is now no true Pope.

For (upon violent intrusion, or Simoniacal choice, or any usurpation) the Cardinals, Bishops, &c. which the Pope createth are not truly such; and consequently their Votes not good in the choice of another Pope; and so successively.

These considerations may suffice to declare the inconsequence of their Discourses, even admitting their Assertions, which yet are so false; or so apparently uncertain.

I shall in the next place level some Arguments directly against their main Conclusion it self.

I. My



I. My first Argument against this pretence shall be, that it is destitute of any good warrant, either from Divine or Humane testimony; and so is groundless. As will appear by the following Considerations.

1. If God had designed the Bishop of *Rome* to be for the perpetual course of times Sovereign Monarch of his Church, it may reasonably be supposed, that he would expressly have declared his mind in the case; it being a point of greatest importance of all that concern the administration of his Kingdom in the World. Princes do not use to send their Vice-Roys unfurnished with Patents clearly signifying their Commission, that no man, out of ignorance or doubt concerning that point, excusably may refuse compliance; And in all equity promulgation is requisite to the establishment of any Law, or exacting obedience. But in all the Pandects of Divine Revelation the Bishop of *Rome* is not so much as once mentioned, either by name, or by character, or by probable intimation; they cannot hook him in otherwise, than by streining hard, and framing a long Chain of Consequences; each of which is too subtle for to constrain any man's persuasion: They have indeed found the Pope in the first Chapter of *Genesis*; for (if we believe Pope *Innocent III.*) he is one of the two great Luminaries there; and he is as plainly there, as any where else in the Bible.

*Nec verò simile sit, ut rem tam necessariam ad Ecclesie unitatem continentem Christus Dominus Apostolis suis non revelarit. Melch. Can. 6.8.*

Neither is it likely that our Lord Christ would not have revealed to his Apostles a thing so necessary for preserving the Unity of the Church.

*Ad Firmamentum igitur Cæli, hoc est Univer-*

*salis Ecclesie, fecit Deus duo magna Luminaria, id est, duas instituit Dignitates, quæ sunt Pontificalis auctoritas, & Regalis potestas, sed illa quæ præest diebus, id est, Spiritualibus, major est; quæ verò Carnalibus, minor, &c. Innoc. III. in Decret. Greg. I. 33.6.*

For the Firmament therefore of Heaven, (*i. e.*) of the Universal Church, God made two great Lights, (*i. e.*) he ordained two Dignities or Powers, which are the Pontifical Authority, and the Regal Power; but that which rules the days, (*i. e.*) Spiritual matters, is the greater, but that which governs Carnal things, is the lesser, &c.

Wherefore if upon this account we should reject this pretence, we might do it justly; and for so doing we have the allowance of the ancient Fathers; for they did not hold any man obliged to admit any point of Doctrine, or rule of Manners, which is not in express words, or in terms equivalent contained in Holy Scripture; or which at least might not thence be deduced by clear and certain inference; this their manner of disputing with Hereticks and heterodox People doth shew; this appeareth by their way of defining and settling Doctrines of Faith; this they often do avow in plain words applicable to our case; for *If* (saith *St. Austin*) *about Christ, or about his Church, or about any other thing; which concerneth our Faith and Life, I will not say We, who are no wise comparable to him, who said Although we; but even as he going on did add, If an Angel from Heaven should tell you beside what you have received in the Legal and Evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema;* in which words we have *St. Austin's* warrant not only to refuse, but to detest this Doctrine, which being no-where extant in Law or Gospel, is yet obtruded on us as nearly relating both to *Christ* and his Church; as greatly concerning both our Faith and Practice.

*Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacumq; alia re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamq; nostram, non dicam Nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, licet si nos, sed omnino quod sequutus adjecit, si Angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit, præterquam quod in Scripturis Legalibus ac Evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit. Aug. contr. Petil. 3.6.*

2. To enforce this Argument, we may consider, that the Evangelists do speak about the propagation, settlement, and continuance of our Lord's Kingdom; that the Apostles do often treat about the state of the

the Church and its edification, order, peace, unity; about the distinction of its Officers and Members, about the qualifications, duties, graces, privileges of Spiritual Governors and Guides; about prevention and remedy of Heresies, Schisms, Disorders; upon any of which occasions how is it possible that the mention of such a Spiritual Monarch (who was to have a main influence on each of those particulars) should wholly escape them, if they had known such an one instituted by God.

In the Levitical Law all things concerning the High-Priest; not only his Designation, Succession, Consecration, Duty, Power, Maintenance, Privileges; but even his Garments, Marriage; Mourning, &c. are punctually determined and described; and is it not wonderful that in the many descriptions of the New-Law, no mention should be made concerning any Duty, or Privilege of its High-Priest? whereby he might be directed in the administration of his Office, and know what observance to require?

3. Whereas also the Scripture doth inculcate duties of all sorts, and doth not forget frequently to press duties of respect and obedience toward particular Governors of the Church; is it not strange that it never should bestow one precept, whereby we might be instructed and admonished to pay our duty to the Universal Pastor? especially considering, that God who directed the Pens of the Apostles, and who intended that their Writings should continue for the perpetual instruction of Christians, did foresee, how requisite such a precept would be to secure that duty; for if but one such precept did appear, it would do the business, and void all contestation about it.

4. They who so carefully do exhort to honour and obey the temporal Sovereignty, how come they so wholly to wave urging the no less needful obligations to obey the Spiritual Monarch? while they are so mindful of the Emperor, why are they so neglectful of the Pope? insomuch, that divers Popes afterward, to ground and urge obedience to them, are fain to borrow those precepts, which command obedience to Princes, accommodating them by analogy and inference to themselves?

5. Particularly Saint Peter, one would think, who doth so earnestly injoin to obey *the King as Supreme*, and to honour him, should not have been unmindful of his Successors; or quite have forborn to warn Christians of the respect due to them: surely the Popes afterward do not follow him in this reservedness; for in their *Decretal Epistles* they urge nothing so much as obedience to the Apostolical See.

6. One might have expected something of that nature from Saint Paul himself, who did write so largely to the Romans, and so often from Rome; that at least some word, or some intimation should have dropped from him concerning these huge Rights and Privileges of this See, and of the regard due to it. Particularly then, when he professedly doth enumerate the Offices, instituted by God, for standing use and perpetual duration; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ; till we all come in the Unity of Faith, &c.

*Quarum laudum & gloria degenerem fuisse, maximum crimen est.* Cl. Rom. ad Cyp. Ep. 31.  
To degenerate from which praise and glory, is an exceeding great crime.

He commendeth them for their Faith, which was spoken of through *Rom. 1.8.* the whole world; yet giving them no advantage above others; as St. Chrysostom observeth on those words; for obedience to the Faith among all Nations, among whom also are ye; this (saith St. Chrysostom) he saith to depress their conceit, to void their haughtiness of mind, and to teach them (to deem others equal in Dignity with them.

Οὐδὲν πλεον ὡς αὐτοῖς διδόναι ὅτι λαοῦν ἐστὶν.

Ταῦτα δὲ ποιεῖ καθεαυτῶν αὐτῶν τὸ εὐσεβήματα, καὶ κινῶν τὸ εὐσεβήματα τὴν διανοίαν, καὶ διδόναν αὐτοῖς τὴν αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν.

When he writeth to that Church (\* which was some time after (\* *Vid.* Saint Peter had settled the Popedom) he doth only stile them *κλητοὶ* Chryf. *ἄγιοι*, (called Saints) and *ἀγαπητοὶ Θεοῦ*, (beloved of God) which are common Theo. adjuncts of all Christians; He saith their Faith was spoken of generally, but of the fame of their Authority being so spread he taketh no notice; that their obedience had come abroad to all men, but their commands had not (it seemeth) come any where. *Hier. 8. 16. 19.*

He wrote divers *Epistles* from Rome, wherein he resolveth many cases debated, yet never doth urge the Authority of the *Roman* Church for any point, which now is so ponderous an Argument.

7. But however seeing the Scripture is so strangely reserved, how cometh it to pass that Tradition is also so defective, and staunch in so grand a case? We have in divers of the Fathers, (particularly in *Tertullian*, in *St. Basil*, in *St. Hierom*) Catalogues of Traditional Doctrines and Observances, which they recite to assert Tradition in some cases supplemental to Scripture; in which their purpose did require, that they should set down those of principal moment; and they are so punctual as to insert many of small consideration; how then came they to neglect this, concerning the Papal Authority over the whole Church, which had been most pertinent to their design, and in consequence did vastly surpass all the rest, which they do name?

*Tertull. de Cor. Mil. 3.*  
*Basil. de Sp. S. 27.*  
*Hier. advers. Lucif. 4.*

8. The designation of the *Roman* Bishop by succession to obtain so high a degree in the Church, being, above all others, a most remarkable and noble piece of History, which it had been a horrible fault in an Ecclesiastical History to slip over, without careful reporting, and reflecting upon it; yet *Eusebius*, that most diligent Compiler of all passages relating to the original Constitution of the Church, and to all transactions therein, hath not one word about it; who yet studiously doth report the Successions of the *Roman* Bishops, and all the notable occurrences he knew concerning them, with favourable advantage.

9. Whereas this Doctrine is pretended to be a Point of Faith, of vast consequence to the subsistence of the Church, and to the Salvation of men, it is somewhat strange, that it should not be inserted into any one ancient Summary of things to be believed (of which Summaries divers remain, some composed by publick consent, others by persons of Eminency in the Church) nor by fair and forcible consequence should be deducible from any Article in them; especially considering that such Summaries were framed upon occasion of Heresies springing up, which disregarded the Pope's Authority, and which by asserting it were plainly confuted. We are therefore beholden to Pope Innocent III. and his *Lateran* Synod, for first Synodically defining this Point, together with other Points no less new and unheard of before. The Creed of Pope Pius IV. formed the other day, is the first, as I take it, which did contain this Article of Faith. *Const. Apost. 7. 41.*  
*(a full Creed at Baptism.)*  
*Conc. Lat. 4. cap. 5.*  
*An. 1215.*



10. It is much that this point of Faith should not be delivered in any of those ancient Expositions of the *Creed* (made by *St. Austin*, *Ruffin*, &c.) which enlarge it to necessary points of Doctrine, connected with the Articles therein; especially with that of the Catholick Church, to which the Pope's Authority hath so close a connexion; that it should not be touched in the Catechetical Discourses of *Cyril*, *Ambrose*, &c. that in the Systems of Divinity composed by *Saint Austin*, *Lactantius*, &c. it should not be treated on: The world is now changed, for the Catechism of *Trent* doth not overlook so material a Point; and it would pass for a lame Body of Theology, which should omit to treat on this Subject.

11. It is more wonderful, that this Point should never be defined, in downright and full terms, by any ancient Synod; it being so notoriously in those old times opposed by divers, who dissented in opinion; and discorded in practice from the Pope; it being also a Point of that consequence, that such a solemn declaration of it would have much conduced to the ruin of all particular Errors and Schisms, which were maintained then in opposition to the Church.

12. Indeed had this Point been allowed by the main Body of Orthodox Bishops, the Pope could not have been so drowsy or stupid, as not to have solicited for such a definition thereof; nor would the Bishops have been backward in compliance thereto; it being, in our Adversaries conceits, so compendious and effectual a way of suppressing all Heresies, Schisms and Disorders; (although indeed later Experience hath shewed it no less available to stifle Truth, Justice and Piety:) The Popes after *Luther* were better advised, and so were the Bishops adhering to his Opinions.

13. Whereas also it is most apparent, that many persons disclaimed this Authority, not regarding either the Doctrines or Decrees of the Popes; it is wonderful, that such men should not be reckoned in the large Catalogues of Hereticks, wherein Errors of less obvious consideration, and of far less importance did place men; If *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, *Leontius*, &c. were so negligent or unconcerned, yet *St. Austin*, *Philastrius*, --- Western men, should not have overlooked this sort of desperate Hereticks; *Aerius* for questioning the Dignity of Bishops is set among the Hereticks, but who got that name for disavowing the Pope's Supremacy, among the many who did it? (It is but lately, that such as we have been thrust in among Hereticks.)

14. Whereas no Point avowed by Christians could be so apt to raise offence and jealousy in Pagans against our Religion as this, which setteth up a Power of so vast extent, and huge influence; whereas no novelty could be more surprizing or startling, than the Erection of an Universal Empire over the Consciences and Religious Practices of men; whereas also this Doctrine could not but be very conspicuous and glaring in ordinary practice; it is prodigious, that all Pagans should not loudly exclaim against it.

It is strange, that Pagan Historians (such as *Marcellinus*, who often speaketh of Popes, and blameth them for their luxurious way of living, and pompous garb: as *Zozimus*, who bore a great spite at Christianity; as all the Writers of the Imperial History before *Constantine*) should not report it, as a very strange pretence newly started up.

*— procedantq; vebiculis insidentes, circumspiciend vestitus, epulas curant; profusos, adeo ut eorum convivias Regales superent mensas.* Marcell. lib. 27. p. 338. They travel sitting in Chariots, curiously apparelled, procuring profuse dainties, insomuch as their meals exceed the feasts of Kings.

It is wonderful, that the eager Adversaries of our Religion (such as *Celsus*, *Porphyrus*, *Hierocles*, *Julian* himself) should not particularly level their Discourse against it, as a most scandalous position and dangerous pretence, threatening the Government of the Empire.

It is admirable, that the Emperors themselves, enflamed with emulation and suspicion of such an Authority (the which hath been so terrible even to Christian Princes) should not in their Edicts expressly decry and impugn it; that indeed every one of them should not with extremest violence implacably strive to extirpate it.

In consequence of these things it may also seem strange, that none of the Advocates of our Faith (*Justin*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, *Cyril*, *Austin*) should be put to defend it, or so much as forced to mention it, in their elaborate Apologies for the Doctrines and Practices, which were reprehended by any sort of Adversaries thereto.

We may add that divers of them in their Apologies and representations concerning Christianity would have appeared not to deal fairly, or to have been very inconsiderate; when they profess for their common belief assertions repugnant to that Doctrine; as when *Tertullian* saith, || *We reverence the Emperor as a man second to God, and less only than God*; when \**Optatus* affirmeth, that above the Emperor there is none beside God who made the Emperor; and that † *Donatus* by extolling himself (as some now do) above the Emperor, did in so doing as it were exceed the bounds of men, that he did esteem himself as God, not as a man. When *St. Chrysostom* asserteth, the Emperor to be the Crown and Head of all men upon earth; and saith, that even *Apostles*, *Evangelists*, *Prophets*, any men whoever are to be subject to the temporal Powers; when (a) *St. Cyril* calleth the Emperor the Supreme top of glory among men, elevated above all others by incomparable differences, &c. When even Popes talk at this rate; as Pope (b) *Gregory I.* calling the Emperor his Lord, and Lord of all, telling the Emperor, that his Competitor, by assuming the title of Universal Bishop, did set himself above the honour of his Imperial Majesty; which he supposeth a piece of great absurdity and arrogance; and even Pope (c) *Gregory II.* doth call that Emperor (against whom he afterward rebelled) the Head of Christians.

Whereas indeed if the Pope be Monarch of the Church, endowed with the Regalities which they now ascribe to him, is it plain enough that he is not inferior to any man living, in real power and dignity; wherefore the modern Doctors of Rome are far more sincere or con-

*Sentiunt enim Deum esse solum, in cuius solius potestate sunt, à quo sunt secundi, post quem primi, ante omnes & super omnes Deos. Quidni? cum super omnes homines, qui vivunt, & mortuis antistant. Tertull. Apolog. c. 30.*

For they think it is God alone in whose power they are, next to whom they are the chief, before all, and above all Gods. And why not? when they are above all men alive, and surpass the dead.

|| *Colimus Imperatorem ut hominem à Deo secundum, & solo Deo minorem. Tertull. ad Scap. 2.*

\* *Cum super Imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus qui fecit Imperatorem. Opt. lib. 3.*

† —dum se *Donatus* super Imperatorem extollit, jam quasi hominum excefferat modum, ut se ut Deum, non hominem aestimaret. *Id. ibid.*

*Βασιλεὺς ὁ κορυφαῖος καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν πάντων τοῦ κόσμου. Chryl. ἀνδρ. 2. p. 463.*

*Καὶ Ἀποστολῶν ἡν, καὶ Εὐαγγελιστῶν, καὶ Προφητῶν, καὶ ἐπιστάντων. Chryl. in Rom. 13. 1.*

*Οὐ γὰρ ὅτι ὁ ἰσχυρότερος ἐκείνῳ τινι ἔχει ὅτι τῆς γῆς, βασιλεὺς ὁ — Chryl. supra.*

For he that is thus wrong'd has not his equal upon earth, for he is King, &c.

(a) *Τῆς μὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐκτελείας τὰ ἀνάτατον καὶ ἀντικειμένης διαφοράς τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἀνεσχεῖς καὶ ὑπερκεῖμενος, ὑμεῖς, ὁ φιλόχερος βασιλεὺς, καὶ κληρὸς ὑμῶν ἐξαιρέτης τῇ καὶ ἁγίᾳ τῶν ὁρίων. Διὸ τῆς ἐκείνης αὐτῶ καὶ πάντων ὑποτάξις. Cyril. ad Theod. in Conc. Eph. part. 1. cap. 3. p. 20.*

(b) *P. Greg. M. Ep. 2. 62.*

*Quia Sereniss. Domine ex illo jam tempore Dominus meus fuisti, quando adhuc Dominus omnium non eras — Ego quidem jussioni subiectus — Ibid.*

*Ad hoc enim potestas Dominorum meorum pietati cælitus data est super omnes homines, &c. Ibid. Ego indignus famulus vester. Ib.*

*Qui honori quoque Imperii vestri se per privatum vocabulum superponit. P. Greg. I. Ep. 4. 32.*

(c) *Ὁς βασιλεὺς καὶ κεφαλὴ τῶν Χριστιανῶν. P. Greg. II. in Epist. 1. ad Leon. Ilaur. apud Bin. Tom. 5. p. 502. King and Head of Christians.*

derate in their Heraldry, than were those old Fathers of Christendom;

—una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N.  
& Antistite nostro N. & Rege nostro N.  
& omnibus Orthodoxis, &c.

Together with thy Servant our Pope N.  
and our Bishop N. and our King N. and  
all Orthodox, &c.

\* *Fiat autem oratio pro dignitate Re-  
gi a post orationem factam pro Papa, quia  
potestas suprema Sacerdotalis excedit Re-  
giam antiquitate, dignitate & utilitate,  
&c. Gab. Biel. in Can. mss.*

Let prayer be made for the King after  
prayer made for the Pope, because the  
supreme Sacerdotal power exceeds the  
Kingly in antiquity, dignity and utility,  
&c.

*Subesse Romano Pontifici omni humana  
creatura declaramus, dicimus, definimus  
& pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessita-  
te salutis. P. Bomf. VIII. in Extrav.  
con. lib. 1. tit. 38.*

Now the mystery is discovered, why Popes, when summoned by

*At quavis utcumque tolerabile sit, ut  
Principes seculares in Concilio sedeant  
ante alios Episcopos, tamen nullo modo  
convenit, ut ante ipsum summum Ponti-  
ficem, &c. Bell. de Conc. 1. 19.*

Emperours, declined to go in Person to General  
Synods; because it was not tolerable that the Em-  
perour (who sometime would be present in Synods) should sit above the Pope; as in the pride of his heart he might perhaps offer to do. (I cannot forbear to note what an ill conceit Bellarmine

had of Leo I. and other Popes, that they did forbear coming at Synods out of their villainous pride and haughtiness.)  
15. One would admire, that Constantine, if he had smelt this Doctrine, or any thing like it in Christianity, should be so ready to embrace it; or that so many Emperours should in those times do so; some Princes then probably being jealous of their honour, and unwilling to admit any Superiour to them.

It is at least much, that Emperours should with so much indulgence foster and cherish Popes, being their so dangerous rivals for dignity;

*Quapropter attendat clementia vestra;  
quantus fuerit erga sedis Apostolicæ reve-  
rentiam Antecessorum vestrorum, piorum  
aurearum Imperatorum—amor, & stu-  
dium; qualiter eam diversis privilegiis  
extulerint, donis ditaverint, beneficiis  
amplaverint; qualiter eam literis suis  
honoraverint, ejus votis annuerint, &c.  
P. Nich. I. Epist. 8. ad Mich. Imp.*

*Apol. Bell.  
p. 202.*

that Emperours should with so much indulgence foster and cherish Popes, being their so dangerous rivals for dignity; and that it should be true, which Pope Nicholas doth affirm; that the Emperours had extolled the Roman See with divers privileges, had enriched it with gifts, had enlarged it with benefits; had done I know not how many things more for it: surely they were bewitched thus to advance their concurrent Competitour for Honour and Power; one who pretended to be a better man than themselves. Bellarmine (in his Apology against King James) saith, that the Pope was (vellet, nollet) constrained to be subject to the Emperours, because his Power was not known to them; it was well it was not: but how could it be concealed from them, if it were a Doctrine commonly avowed by Christians? it is hard keeping so practical a Doctrine from breaking forth into light. But to leave this consideration.

Farthermore, We have divers ancient Writings, the special nature, matter, scope whereof did require, or greatly invite giving attestation to this Power, if such an one had been known and allowed in those times; which yet do afford no countenance, but rather much prejudice thereto.



16. The *Apostolical Canons*, and the *Constitutions of Clement*, which describe the state of the Church, with its Laws, Customs and Practices current in the times of those who compiled them (which times are not certain, but ancient, and the less ancient the more it is to our purpose) wherein especially the Ranks, Duties and Privileges of all Ecclesiastical Persons are declared, or prescribed, do not yet touch the Prerogatives of this Universal Head, or the special respects due to him, nor mention any Laws or Constitutions framed by him: Which is no less strange, than that there should be a Body of Laws, or description of the state of any Kingdom, wherein nothing should be said concerning the King, or the Royal Authority. It is not so in our modern *Canon-Law*, wherein the Pope doth make *utramque paginam*; we read little beside his Authority, and Decrees made by it.

The *Apostolical Canons*, particularly do prescribe, that the *Bishops of each Nation* should know him that is first among them, and should esteem him the Head, and should do nothing considerable (or extraordinary) without his advice; as also that each one (of those Head-Bishops) should only meddle with those affairs which concerned his own precinct, and the places under it: also, that no such Primate should do any thing without the opinion of all; that so there may be concord: Now what place could be more opportune to mention the Pope's Sovereign Power? how could the Canonist without strange neglect pass it over? doth he not indeed exclude it, assigning the Supreme disposal (without farther resort) of all things to the arbitration of the whole body of Pastours, and placing the maintenance of concord in that course?

17. So also the Old Writer, under the name of *Dionysius the Areopagite*, treating in several places about the degrees of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, was monstrously overseen in omitting the Sovereign thereof: In the fifth Chapter of his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy he professeth carefully to speak of those Orders, but hath not a word of this supereminent rank, but averreth *Episcopacy to be the first and highest of divine Orders, in which the Hierarchy is consummated*: and in his Epistle to *Demophilus* there is a remarkable place, wherein he could hardly have avoided touching the Pope, had there been then one in such vogue as now: for advising that Monk to gentleness and observance toward his Superiours, he thus speaketh: *Let passion and reason be governed by you; but you by the holy Deacons, and these by the Priests, and the Priests by the Bishops, and the Bishops by the Apostles, or by their Successors*; (that is, faith *Maximus*, those which we now call *Patriarchs*) and if perhaps any one of them shall fail of his duty, let him be corrected by those holy persons, who are co-ordinate to him; why not in this case, let him be corrected by the Pope, his Superiour? but he knew none of an Order superiour to the Apostles Successors.

18. Likewise, *Ignatius* in many *Epistles* frequently describeth the several Ranks of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, extollet their Dignity and Authority;

Const. Apost. 8. 4.  
Ec.

Τὸς Ἐπισκόπους ἐκείνη ἔδνευ εἶναι χρὴ  
ἢ ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον, καὶ ἡγῆσαι αὐτὸν ὡς  
κεφαλὴν, καὶ μηδὲν τι πρῶτον πρῶτον  
ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης. ἐκεῖνα δὲ μὴ  
πρῶτον ἕκαστον, ὅσα τῷ αὐτῷ παρεκκλ.  
ἐπέκεινται, καὶ ἢ αὐτῷ ῥόγῃς, ἀλλὰ  
μηδὲ ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς πάντων γνώμης  
ποιεῖται τι. ἔτω δὲ ὁμοῖα ἔσται. Apost.  
Can. 34.

Ἡ δεῖα τῶν ἱεραρχῶν τάξις πρῶτη ἰδὲ  
ὅτι τῶν ἐπισκοπικῶν τάξεων, ἀκροτάτη ἢ καὶ  
ἐσχάτη ἡ αὐτή, καὶ ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποτε-  
λεῖται καὶ ἀποπληροῦται πᾶσα τῆς κλδ' ἡ-  
μεῖς ἱεραρχίας διακρίσις. Dionys. de Hier.  
Eccl. cap. 5.

Ἐπειδὴ τὰς ἱεραρχικὰς τάξεις καὶ ἀποπλη-  
ρώσεις, διατάμει πρῶτον καὶ ἐργασίας εἰρη-  
καμῶν ὡς ἡμῶν ἐπικλόν. De Eccl. Hier.  
cap. 5.

Αὐτὸς μὲν ἔν ὁπθυσία καὶ θυμῷ καὶ λό-  
γῳ τὰ κατ' αἴγιαν ἀφοδεῖ. σοὶ δὲ οἱ  
δεῖοι λειτουργοὶ καὶ τέτοιοι οἱ ἱερεῖς ἱερό-  
ται καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἱεράρχαις οἱ  
ἀποστολὴ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων διάδοχοι καὶ  
εἴπω τις καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοις τὰ πρῶτον ἀπο-  
σταλῆναι, παρὰ τῶν ὁμοταγῶν ἀρίων ἐπινοοῦν-  
θῆσαι. Ec. Dionys. Ar. Ep. 8.  
Ἀποστόλων δὲ διαδοχὰς καὶ νῦν Πατρι-  
άρχας ἡγῆμαι εἶ. Max. Schol. 10.

Authority to the highest pitch, mightily urgeth the respect due to them, yet never doth he so much as mention or touch this Sovereign degree, wherein the Majesty of the Clergy did chiefly shine.

In his very *Epistle* to the *Romans* he doth not yield any deference to their Bishop, nor indeed doth so much as take notice of him; is it not strange he should so little mind the Sovereign of the Church? or was it, for a fly reason, because being Bishop of *Antioch* he had a pique to his brother *Jacob*, who had supplanted him and got away his birth-right?

Οὐτε δὲ τις κρείσσον, ἢ ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος  
ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔσιν, ἔσθ' ὃ ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ.  
Ἐπισκόπου τι μᾶλλον. Pseud. Ignat. ad  
Smyrn.

Τί δ' ὅτιν' Ἐπίσκοπος, ὅς' ἢ πᾶσι  
ἀρχὴς καὶ ἡγεσία ἐπέκεινα, &c. id ad  
Trall.

The counterfeiter therefore of *Ignatius* did well personate him, when he saith, that *in the Church there is nothing greater than a Bishop*; and that *a Bishop is beyond all rule and authority*; for in the time of *Ignatius* there was no domineering Pope over all Bishops.

19. We have some Letters of Popes, (though not many; for Popes were then not very scribacious, or not so pragmatistical; whence to supply that defect, lest Popes should seem not able to write, or to have slept almost 400 years, they have forged divers for them, and those so wise ones, that we who love the memory of those good Popes, disdain to acknowledge them Authors of such idle stuff; we have yet some Letters of,) and to Popes, to and from divers eminent Persons in the Church, wherein the former do not assume, nor the latter ascribe any such power; the Popes do not express themselves like Sovereigns, nor the Bishops address themselves like Subjects; but they treat one another in a familiar way like brethren and equals: this is so true, that it is a good mark of a spurious *Epistle* (whereof we have good store, devised by colloquing Knaves, and fathered on the first Popes) when any of them talketh in an imperious strain, or arrogateth such a Power to himself.

20. *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome* in the Apostolical times unto the Church of *Corinth*, then engaged in discords and factions, wherein the Clergy

Ὅρωμεν δ' ὅτι ἐπὶ οὖν ὑμῶν μεταστάται  
καλῶς πολιτοδομήσας ἐκ τῆς ἀμείνων αὐ-  
τοῖς τιμημένης λειτουργίας. Clem. ad Co-  
rinth. Ep. i. p. 58. Jun.

For we see that you have removed some who behaved themselves well in their Office, out of their ministry blamelessly discharged by them.

Στασιζέτω ὁὖν τοὺς ἀρεσβυτήρας.

Προσώπων  
προσώπων  
καὶ αὐτῶν.  
p. 2.

such a case one would think if ever, for quashing such disorders and quelling so perverse folks, who spurned the Clergy, it had been decent, it had been expedient, to employ his Authority, and to speak like himself, challenging obedience, upon duty to him, and at their peril: How would a moderate Pope have ranted in such a case; how thundering a Bull would he have dispatched against such outrageous contemners of the Ecclesiastick Order? how often would he have spoken of the Apostolick See and its Authority? we should infallibly have heard him swag-

Si quis voluntati nostrae contraire prae-  
sumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis  
Dei, ac Beatorum Petri & Pauli Aposto-  
li se noverit incursum: in such terms  
usually the Pope's Bulls do end.

that good Pope did not know his own strength, or had not the heart to use it.

Whoever shall presume to cross our will, let him know that he shall incur the indignation of Almighty God, and his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul: but our Popes, it seemeth have more wit, or better mettle than Pope Clement;

*Quàm ex æquo, & civilis mentio Episcopi Romani ab Episcopo Carthaginiis apud Clerum? Rigalt. Ibid.*

Pope *Liberius* hath an Epistle to *St. Athanasius*, wherein he not only (for his Libection and satisfaction) doth inquire his opinion about the Point; but professeth, in complement perchance, that he shall obediently follow it; *Write*, faith he, *whether you do think as we do and just so about the true faith; that I may be undoubtedly assured about what you think good to command me*; was not that spoken indeed like a courteous Sovereign, and an accomplished Judge in matters of Faith? The same Pope in the head of the Western, doth write to a knot of Eastern Bishops, whom they call *their beloved Brethern and fellow Ministers*; and in a brotherly strain, not like an Emperour.

Γεσίον, ἐν ᾧ οὐκ ὄραται καὶ τὸ  
μῦθος, καὶ τὰ ἴσα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἴσως  
καὶ οὐκ ἀποφασίζοντες ὅτι ἀδυνατεῖται  
ἐπὶ τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀντικειμένῳ  
καὶ οὐκ ἀντικειμένῳ. Liber. ad Ath.  
Tom. 1. p. 243.

In



Ep. 61. 69. 70. 74. 182.

Ἰμῶς ὡς χαλῶμεν συμπαθεῖσα ἡμῶν ἢ διαίεσσι. Ep. 61.

Εἴτι ἐν παρεμύθιον ἀγάπης, εἴτις κοινωνία πνεύματος, εἴτις ἀλλήλῃς καὶ οἰκτρμοὶ, κινήθητε πρὸς ἢ ἀντιλήψιν ἡμῶν. Ibid.

We beseech you to have a fellow-feeling of our distractions.

If there be any comfort of love, any fellowship of the Spirit, any bowels and mercies, be ye moved with pity and commiseration to help us.

Δότε ἡμεῖς τοῖς εἰς ῥόνυ κλιθεῖσι, συγκινήθητε ἐφ' ἡμῶν τὰ ἀδελφικά, ὑμῶν σπλάγχνα, παρεμύθητε δάκρυα συμπαθείας. Ep. 69.

Ἐπιβοσάμεθα τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην εἰς τὴν ἀντιλήψιν ἡμῶν καὶ συμπαθεῖαν. Ep. 70.

Ἐλθεῖν πᾶς παρ' ὑμῶν εἰς ὁπίσταν καὶ ὡς ἐμυθίζον ἢ ἐλικομύθων. Ibid. Vide Ep. 74. (εἰ μὲν διορθώσιν, ἢ κοινωνικῶς, &c.

Ἐάν ἢ καὶ συμφώνως πλείονες ὁμῶς τὰ οὐτὰ δόγμασιν, δῆλον ὅτι τὸ πλεῖστον ἢ δόγμασιν ἀντιρρήτων πᾶσι τὴν ὡς ἀδελφικὴν καὶ ἀσκήσει τὰ δόγματα. Ep. 74. (Ep. 293.)

ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν βοδείας τῶν καὶ ἡμῶν Ἐκκλησίας, τὴν ὡς ἢ ἡλικῶν Ἐπισκόπων σύμποιαν. Ep. 48.

Τὰς ἀντιρρήσεις τοῖς κοινοῖς ὁρᾶται, ἢ τὴν κερταίναν τὰ ἀξίως τὴν πλείονος διουσιμῶν, καὶ ἢ ἐκαστὸν λαὸν ἀκαλοῦντων αὐτοῖς ἀντιρρήτως. Ibid.

Ἰμῶς ἢ, ὅσον μακρὰν αὐτῶν ἀπωσιμῶν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ποσὺν πλείον ὡς τοῖς καὶ εἰς ἀξίως ἔχετε. Ep. 74.

In the time of *Damasus*, Successor to *Liberius*, *St. Basil* hath divers Epistles to the Western Bishops, wherein having represented and bewailed the wretched state of the Eastern Churches, then over-born with Heresies, and unsettled by Factions, he craveth their Charity, their Prayers, *their sympathy, their comfort, their brotherly aid*; by affording to the Orthodox and sound Party, the countenance of their Communion, by joining with them in contention for Truth and Peace; for that the Communion of so great Churches would be of mighty weight to support and strengthen their Cause; giving credit thereto among the People, and inducing the Emperour to deal fairly with them, in respect to such a multitude of adherents; especially of those which were at such a distance, and not so immediately subject to the Eastern Emperour; for, *If*, saith he, *very many of you do concur unanimously in the same opinion, it is manifest, that the multitude of consenter's will make the Doctrine to be received without contradiction*; and, *I know*, saith he again, writing to *Athanasius* about these matters, *but one way of redress to our Churches, the conspiring with us of the Western Bishops, the which being obtained, would probably yield some advantage to the publick, the secular Power revering the credibility of the multitude, and the people all about following them without repugnance*: and, *You*, saith he to the Western Bishops, *the farther you dwell from them, the more credible you will be to the people*.

This indeed was according to the ancient Rule and Practice in such cases, that any Church being oppressed with Errour, or distracted with Contentions, should from the Bishops of other Churches, receive aid to the removal of those inconveniences. That it was the Rule doth appear from what we have before spoken, and of the Practice there be many instances; for so did *St. Cyprian* send two of his Clergy to *Rome* to compose the Schism there, moved by *Novatian* against *Cornelius*; \* so was *St. Chrysostome* called to *Ephesus* (although out of his Jurisdiction) to settle things there; so (to omit divers instances occurring in History) *St. Basil* himself was called by the Church of *Iconium* to visit it, and to give it a Bishop; although it did not belong to his ordinary inspection; and he doth tell the Bishops of the † Coasts, that they should have done well in sending some to visit and assist his Churches in their distresses.

\* Quod servus Dei, & maxime Sacerdotibus justis & pacificis congruebat, frater charissime, miseramus

nuper Collegas nostros Caldonium & Fortunatum, ut non tantum persuasione literarum nostrarum, sed presentia sua, & consilio omnium vestrum eniterentur, quantum possent, & elaborarent, ut ad Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem scissi corporis membra componeret. — Cypr. Ep. 42. ad Cornel. Pallad.

As it becometh the Servants of God, especially righteous and peaceable Priests, most dear Brother, we lately sent our Collegues Caldonius and Fortunatus, that they might, not only by the persuasion of our Letters, but also by their presence, and the advice of you all, endeavour to their utmost and strive to reduce the members of that divided Body to the Unity of the Catholick Church.

Αὐτὴ καλεῖ καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐπισκοπῶν, ὡς αὐτῇ δέσσει Ἐπισκοποῦν. Bas. Ep. 8. † ὡς ἡμεῖς.

Ἀκολούθῳ ἢ παρὰ ἢ ὑμῶν ἀγάπης καὶ ἢ ἡλικῶν ἀποστολῶν ὡς καὶ εἰς ἐπισκοπῶν ἡμῶν ἢ καὶ ἀποστολῶν. Ep. 77.

But

But now how, I pray, cometh it to pass, that in such a case he should not have a special recourse to the Pope? but in so many addresses should only wrap him up in a community? why should he not humbly petition him to exert his Sovereign Authority for the relief of the Eastern Churches, laying his charge, and inflicting censures on the dissenters? why should he lay all the stress of his hopes on the consent of the Western Bishops? why doth he not say a word of the dominion resident in them over all the Church? these things are unconceivable, if he did take the Pope to be the man our Adversaries say he is.

But St. Basil had other notions; for indeed, being so wise and good a man, if he had taken the Pope for his Sovereign, he would not have taxed him as he doth, and so complain of him; when speaking of the Western Bishops (whereof the Pope was the ringleader, and most concerned) he hath these words; (occasioned as I conceive by the Bishop of Rome's rejecting that excellent person, Meletius Bishop of Antioch;)

What we should write, or how to join with those that write, I am in doubt—for I am apt to say that of Diomedes, You ought not to request, for he is a haughty man; for in truth observance doth render men of proud manners more contemptuous than otherwise they are. For if the Lord be propitious to us, what other

Τὸ ὄντι δὲ διαταράσσεται τὰ ὑποκείμενα  
ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῷ ὑποκειμένῳ γινώσκοντι πρὸς  
τοὺς. Bas. Ep. 10. ad Euseb. Samos.  
Ep.

→ Ποία βοήθεια ὑμῶν τῆς ὁπικίης  
 ὀφρῦ; οἱ τὸν ἀνδρὶς ἔτε ἴσπαν ἔτε  
 μακρὴν ἀνέχον, ἰδοὺς τὴν ἰστορίαν ἀπε-  
 λημνίαν, οὐκ ἐνὰ ποιήσειν, ἀ περὶ τὴν  
 ἐπὶ Μαρκίῳ, οὐκ ἐν τῷ πᾶσι τὴν ἀληθείαν  
 αὐτοῖς ἀπαγγέλλοντας φιλοφρονισάμεν-  
 τιν τὴν αἴρεσιν δι' ἐκείνῃ βεβαιώσασιν  
 Ibid.

Ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινῆς ὁμ-  
μασίης ἐκκλόμεν αὐτῶν ὁπισθεῖμαι τῷ κε-  
ραταίῳ, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑκκλησιαστικῆς ἱ-  
στορίας, ἐκ μὲν ὅσον περιγράφει, ὅτι ἐπεὶ ἴσ-  
την τὴν παρ' ἡμῶν τὴν ἀληθεῖαν, ὅτε τὴν  
δοξάν δι' ἧς ἀν' ἡμῶν καλεῖσθαι λέγονται, κα-  
τοῖχα τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ δὲ τοῖς ἰστέροις μὴ  
περιλαμβανόμεναι ταπεινωθεῖσιν ὁπισθεῖσιν, ἡ-  
μεῖς ἀξίωμα κείνων ὑποφωτισμένον, ἀμάρτυ-  
ρον, καὶ μόνον ἀρκούν ἔχοντες ποιήσας εἰς  
δοξάν. Ibid.

[illegible]

*position is adverse from illiberal flattery?* But these speeches sute with that conceit, which St. Basil (as Baronius I know not whence reporteth) expressed by saying, *I hate the pride of that Church*; which humour in them that good man would not be guilty of fostering by too much obsequiousness.

St. Chrysostome, having by the practices of envious men combined against him, in a packed assembly of Bishops, upon vain surmises, been sentenced and driven from his See, did thereupon write an Epistle to Pope Innocent I. Bishop of Rome, together with his Brethren the Bishops of Italy; therein representing his case, complaining of the wrong, vindicating his innocency, displaying the iniquity of the proceedings against him, together with the mischievous consequences of them toward the whole Church, then requiring his succour for redress: yet, (although the sense of his case, and care of his interest were likely to suggest the greatest difference that could be) neither the style, which is very respectful, nor the matter, which is very copious, do imply any acknowledgment of the Pope's Supremacy: He doth not address to him

Προς τὸν ὑμῶν ἀναθεσμὴν ἀγά-  
πῃ.

Διὰ τὸν ἀγαπῶν ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ.

as to a Governour of all, who could by his Authority command justice to be done, but as to a brother, and a friend of innocence, from whose endeavour he might procure relief; He had recourse not to his Sovereign power, but to his brotherly love; He informed his Charity, not appealed to his bar; He in short did no more than implore his assistance in an Ecclesiastical way; that he would express his resentment of so irregular dealings, that he would avow communion with him, as with an Orthodox Bishop innocent and abused, that he would procure his cause to be brought to a fair trial in a Synod of Bishops, lawfully called and indifferently affected:

— Ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοις, ἢ ἐκ  
ἐλεγχέντες, ἢ ἀποδείχοντες ἁπλοῦς,  
ἢ γεγραμμένων τῶν ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀπολαύ-  
σας, καὶ τῶν ἀγίων, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἄλλων,  
ὧν καὶ ἐμμενόμεθα.

But as for us, we who are not condemned nor convicted, nor proved guilty, let us continually enjoy the benefit of your Letters, and Love, and all other things as before.

other to his Clergy and People could only comfort them, declare his dislike of the Adversaries proceedings and grounds; signifie his intentions to procure a general Synod, with hopes of a redress thence; his Sovereign power, it seems, not availing to any such purposes, But what (saith he) can we do in such cases? a Synodical cognizance is necessary, which we heretofore did say ought to be called; the which alone can allay the motions of such tempests.

\* Ἀλλὰ τί καὶ τῶν τοιούτων καὶ ἐν τῷ  
παρόντι ποιήσωμεν; ἀναγκαῖα ὅτι διὰ  
γνώσεως Συνοδικῆς καὶ πάλαι ἐρημῆς  
Συνεδριάζουσιν μὴν γὰρ ὅτι, ὅτις δύνα-  
ται κρίνειν τῶν τοιούτων καὶ ἀναγκαῖα ἐστὶν  
ἔσθαι. — Soz. 8. 16.

It is true that the later Popes (Siricius, Anastasius, Innocent, Zozimus, Bonifacius, Celestinus, &c.) after the Sardican Council in their Epistles to the Western Bishops, over whom they had encroached, and who were over-powered by them, &c. do speak in somewhat more lofty strain; but are more modest toward those of the East, who could not bear, &c.



22. Father; It is most prodigious that in the disputes managed by the Fathers against Hereticks (the *Gnosticks, Valentiniens, Marcionites, Montanists, Manichees, Paulianists, Arians, &c.*) they should not, even in the first place alledge and urge the sentence of the Universal Pastour and Judge, as a most evidently conclusive argument, as the most efficacious and compendious method of convincing and silencing them: Had this point been well proved and pressed, then without any more concertations from Scripture, tradition, reason, all Hereticks had been quite defeated; and nothing then could more easily have been proved, if it had been true when the light of tradition did shine so brightly; nothing indeed had been to sense more conspicuous, than the continual exercise of such an Authority.

We see now among those, who admit such an Authority, how surely when it may be had it is alledged, and what sway it hath, to the determination of any controversie; and so it would have been then, if it had been then as commonly known and avowed.

23. Whereas divers of the Fathers purposely do treat on methods of confuting Hereticks, it is strange they should be so blind or dull, as not to hit on this most proper and obvious way of referring debates to the decision of him, to whose Office of Universal Pastor and Judge it did belong: Particularly one would wonder at *Vincentius Lirinensis*; that he on set purpose, with great care discoursing about the means of settling points of Faith, and of overthrowing Heresies, should not light upon this notable way, by having recourse to the Pope's Magisterial sentence; yea, that indeed he should exclude it; for he (after most intent study, and diligent inquiry, consulting the best and wisest men) could find but two ways of doing it: *I* (saith he) did always and from almost every one receive this answer, That if either I or any other would find out the frauds, and avoid the snares of up-start Hereticks, and continue sound and upright in the true Faith, he should guard and strengthen his Faith, God helping him, by these two means, viz. First by the Authority of the Divine Law, and then by the Tradition of the Catholick Church. And again, We before have said, that this hath always been, and is at present the Custom of Catholicks, that they prove their Faith by these two ways, First by Authority of the Divine Canon, then by the Tradition of the Universal Church.

Is it not strange that he (especially being a Western man, living in those parts, where the Pope had got much sway, and who doth express great reverence to the Apostolick See) should omit that way of determining points, which of all, (according to the modern conceits about the Pope) is most ready and most sure.

24. In like manner *Tertullian* professeth the Catholicks in his time to use such compendious methods of confuting Hereticks: *We* (saith he) when we would dispatch against Hereticks for the Faith of the Gospel, do commonly use these short ways, which do maintain both the order of times prescribing against the lateness of impostours, and the Authority of the Churches patronizing Apostolical tradition;

Q

*Sape igitur magno studio, & summa attentione perquirens à quamplurimis sanctitate & doctrina præstantibus viris, &c. p. 316. (in edit. Baluf.)*

*Hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus ferè retuli, quod siue ego, siue quis alius vellet exurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueoque vitare, & in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere, duplici modo munire fidem suam Domino adjuvante deberet; Primo scilicet divine legis Auctoritate, tum deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Traditione. p. 317.*

*Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper & esse hodie Catholicorum consuetudinem ut fidem veram duobus his modis adprobent; Primum divini Canonis Auctoritate, deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Traditione. p. 364.*

*His ferè compendiis utimur, quum de Evangelii fide adversus Hæreticos expugnemus, defendentibus & temporum ordinem posteritati falsariorum præscribentem, & Auctoritatem Ecclesiarum traditioni Apostolorum patrocinantem. Tertull. in Marc. 4. 5.*

\* but

\* Solemus hereticis compendii gratia de posteritate præscribere. Tertull. contra Hermog. cap. 1.

\* but why did he skip over a more compendious way, than any of those, namely, standing to the judgment of the *Roman Bishop*?

25. It is true that both he, and St. *Irenæus* before him, disputing against the Hereticks of their times, who had introduced pernicious novelties of their own devising, when they alledge the general consent of Churches (planted by the Apostles, and propagated by continual successions of Bishops from those whom

The like discourse against Hereticks doth *Clement Alex.* use *Strom.* 7. p. 549.

the Apostles did ordain) in doctrines and practices opposite to those devices, as a good argument (and so indeed it then was, next to a demonstration) against them, do produce the *Roman Church*, as a principal one among them, upon several obvious accounts; And this indeed argueth the *Roman Church* to have been then one competent witness, or credible retainer of tradition; as also were the other Apostolical Churches, to whose Testimony they likewise appeal; but what is this to the *Roman Bishop's* judicial Power in such cases? why do they not urge that in plain terms? they would certainly have done so, if they had known it, and thought it of any validity.

Do but mark their words, involving the force of their argumentation;

Cum autem ad eam iterum traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successores Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus — *Iren.* 3. 2.

Constabit id esse ab Apostolis traditum quod apud Ecclesias Apostolicas fuerit sacrosanctum; videamus quod hoc à Paulo Corinthiis hauserint; quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses, Ephesi; quid etiam Romani de proximo sonent; quibus Evangelium & Petrus & Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatam reliquerunt; habemus & Johannis alumnas Ecclesias, &c. *Adv. Marc.* 4. 5.

Constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis matricibus & originalibus fides conspiret, veritati deputandum, id sine dubio tenentem quod Ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli à Christo, Christus à Deo suscepit; reliquam vero doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandum, quæ sapiat contra veritatem Ecclesiarum, & Apostolorum, & Christi, & Dei. Tert. de præscr. 21.

When (saith *Irenæus*) we do again (after allegation of Scripture) appeal to that tradition, which is from the Apostles, which by successions of Presbyters is preserved in the Church: and, That (saith *Tertullian*) will appear to have been delivered by the Apostles, which hath been kept as holy in the Apostolical Churches: let us see what milk the *Corinthians* did draw from Paul; what the *Philippians*, the *Thessalonians*, the *Ephesians* do read: what also the *Romans* our nearer neighbours do say, to whom both Peter and Paul did leave the Gospel sealed with their Blood; we have also the Churches nursed by John, &c. Again, It is therefore manifest (saith he, in his *Prescriptions against Hereticks*) that every doctrine, which doth conspire with those Apostolical Churches, in which the Faith originally was planted, is to be accounted true; as undoubtedly holding that, which the Churches did receive from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; but all other doctrine is to be prejudged false, which doth think against the truth of the Churches,

and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God: their argumentation then in short is plainly this, that the conspiring of the Churches in doctrines contrary to those, which the Hereticks vented, did irrefragably signify those doctrines to be Apostolical; which discourse doth no-wise favour the *Roman* pretences, but indeed, if we do weigh it, is very prejudicial thereto; it thereby appearing, that Christian Doctrines then in the canvassing of points and assuring tradition had no peculiar regard to the *Roman Churches* testimonies; no deference at all to the *Roman Bishop's* Authority; (not otherwise at least than to the Authority of one single Bishop yielding attestation to tradition.)

26. It is odd, that even old Popes themselves in elaborate tracts disputing against Hereticks (as Pope *Celestine* against *Nestorius* and *Pelagius*, Pope *Leo* against *Eutyches* — ) do content themselves to urge testimonies

nies of Scripture, and arguments grounded thereon; not alledging their own definitive Authority, or using this perious argumentation, *I, the Supreme Doctour of the Church, and Judge of Controversies, do assert thus; and therefore you are obliged to submit your assent.*

27. It is matter of amazement, if the Pope were such as they would have him to be, that in so many bulky Volumes of ancient Fathers, living through many ages after *Christ*, in those vast treasuries of learning and knowledge, wherein all sorts of truth are displayed, all sorts of duty are pressed; this momentous point of doctrine and practice should no-where be expressed in clear and peremptory terms; (I speak so, for that by wresting words, by impertinent application, by straining consequences the most ridiculous positions imaginable may be deduced from their Writings.)

It is strange that somewhere or other, at least incidentally, in their Commentaries upon the Scripture, wherein many places concerning the Church and its Hierarchy do invite to speak of the Pope; in their Treatises about the Priesthood, about the Unity and Peace of the Church, about Heresie and Schism; in their Epistles concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs; in their Historical Narrations about occurrences in the Church, in their concertations with heterodox Adversaries, they should not frequently touch it, they should not sometimes largely dwell upon it.

Is it not marvellous, that *Origen*, *St. Hilary*, *St. Cyril*, *St. Chrysostome*, *St. Hierome*, *St. Austin*, in their Commentaries and Tractates upon those places of Scripture [*Tu es Petrus. Pasce oves.*] whereon they now build the Papal Authority, should be so dull and drowsie as not to say a word concerning the Pope?

That *St. Austin* in his so many elaborate Tractates against the *Donatists*, (wherein he discourseth so prolixly about the Church, its Unity, Communion, Discipline) should never insist upon the duty of Obedience to the Pope, or charge those Schismaticks with their rebellion against him, or alledge his Authority against them?

If we consider that the Pope was Bishop of the Imperial City, the *Metropolis* of the World; that he thence was most eminent in rank, did abound in wealth, did live in great splendour and reputation; had many dependences, and great opportunities to gratify, and relieve many of the Clergy; that of the Fathers, whose Volumes we have, all well affected towards him, divers were personally obliged to him, for his support in their distress (as *Athanasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*;) or as to their Patrons and Benefactors (as *St. Hierome*) divers could not but highly respect him as Patron of the cause wherein they were engaged (as *Basil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Hilary*, *Gregory Nyssene*, *Ambrose*, *Austin*;) some were his partizans in a common quarrel (as *Cyril*;) divers of them lived in places and times wherein he had got much sway, (as all the Western Bishops;) that he had then improved his Authority much beyond the old limits: that all the Bishops of the Western or Latine Churches had a peculiar dependence on him (especially after that by advantage of his Station, by favour of the Court, by colour of the *Sardican* Canons, by voluntary deferences and submissions, by several tricks he had wound himself to meddle in most of their chief Affairs:) that hence divers Bishops were tempted to admire, to court, to flatter him; that divers aspiring Popes were apt

Τῆς Ῥωμαίων ὁποσοῦς ὁμοίως τῇ Ἀ-  
λεξανδρείᾳ πρὸς τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐπὶ δυναστίαν  
ἦδη πάλαι περιελάμβανεν.

Socr. 7. 11.

The Bishoprick of Rome is like to that of Alexandria, having now long ago arrived to that height of Power above and beyond the Priesthood.



to encourage the commendars of their Authority which they themselves were apt to magnifie and inculcate; considering, I say, such things, it is a wonder, that in so many voluminous discourfes so little should be said favouring this pretence, so nothing that proveth it, [so much that crosseth it, so much indeed (as I hope to shew) that quite overthroweth it.]

If it be asked how we can prove this, I answer, that (beside who carefully peruseth those Old Books, will easily see it) we are beholden to our Adversaries for proving it to us, when they least intended us such a favour; for that no clear and cogent passages for proof of this pretence can be thence fetched, is sufficiently evident from the very allegations, which after their most diligent raking in old Books they produce; the which are so few, and fall so very short of their purpose, that without much stretching they signifie nothing.

28. It is monstrous, that in the Code of the Catholick Church (consisting of the decrees of so many Synods, concerning Ecclesiastical order and discipline) there should not be one Canon directly declaring his Authority; nor any mention made of him, except thrice accidentally; once upon occasion of declaring the Authority of the *Alexandrine* Bishop, the other upon occasion of assigning to the Bishop of *Constantinople* the *second place of honour*, and *equal privileges* with him.

Conc. Nic.  
Can. 6.  
Conc.  
Const.  
Can. 2.  
Conc.  
Chalc.  
Can. 28.

If it be objected, that these Discourses are negative, and therefore of small force; I answer, that therefore they are most proper to assert such a negative proposition; for how can we otherwise better shew a thing not to be, than by shewing it to have no footstep there, where it is supposed to stand? how can we more clearly argue a matter of right to want proof, than by declaring it not to be extant in the Laws grounding such right; not taught by the Masters, who profess to instruct in such things; not testified in records concerning the exercise of it? such arguments indeed in such cases are not merely negative, but rather privative; proving things not to be, because not affirmed there, where in reason they ought to be affirmed; standing therefore upon positive Suppositions, that Holy Scripture, that general tradition are not imperfect and lame toward their design; that ancient Writers were competently intelligent, faithful, diligent; that all of them could not conspire in perpetual silence about things, of which they had often fair occasion, and great reason to speak: In fine, such considerations, however they may be deluded by Sophistical Wits, will yet bear great sway, and often will amount near to the force of demonstration, with men of honest prudence. However we shall proceed to other discourfes more direct and positive against the Popish Doctrine.

II. Secondly, we shall shew that this pretence, upon several accounts, is contrary to the Doctrine of Holy Scripture.

1. This pretence doth thwart the Holy Scripture, by assigning to another the Prerogatives and peculiar Titles appropriated therein to our Lord.

1 Cor. 8. 6. The Scripture asserteth him to be our only Sovereign Lord and King:  
12. 5. To us (saith it) there is one Lord; and, One King shall be King over them;  
Eph. 4. 5. who shall reign over the house of David for ever; and of his Kingdom there  
Ez. 37. 22. shall be no end; who is the only Potentate; the King of Kings and Lord of  
Luk. 1. 33. Lords; the One Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy.  
1 Ti. 6. 15. The Scripture speaketh of one Arch-Pastour and great Shepherd of the  
Jam. 4. 12. Sheep; exclusively to any other; for I will (saith God in the Pro-  
1 Pet. 5. 4. phet) set up one Shepherd over them; and he shall feed the Sheep:  
2. 25. and  
Heb. 13. 20.  
Ez. 34. 23.

and There (saith our Lord himself) shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd; who that shall be, he expresth adding, *I am the good Shepherd; the good Shepherd giveth his life for the Sheep* (by Pope Boniface his good leave, who maketh Saint Peter or himself this Shepherd.)

The Scripture telleth us, that we have one High Priest of our Profession, answerable to that one in the Jewish Church, his Type.

The Scripture informeth us, that there is but one Supreme Doctor, Guide, Father of Christians, prohibiting us to acknowledge any other for such; *Ye are all Brethren; and call ye not any one Father upon Earth; for one is your Father, even he that is in Heaven; Neither be ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ.* Good Pope Gregory (not the Seventh of that name) did take this for a good argument; for *What therefore, dearest Brother, (said he to John of Constantinople) wilt thou say in that terrible trial of the Judge who is coming; who dost affect to be called not only Father, but General Father in the World.*

*Quid ergo, frater charissime, in illo terribili examine venientis judicis dicturus es, qui non solum Pater, sed etiam generalis Pater in Mundo vocari appetis?*  
Greg. M. Epist. 4. 38.

The Scripture representeth the Church as a building whereof Christ himself is the chief Corner-stone; as a Family, whereof he being the Father-familias, as all others are fellow-servants; as one Body, having one Head; whom God hath given to be head over all things to the Church, which is his Body.

He is the One Spouse of the Church, which title one would think he might leave peculiar to our Lord; there being no Vice-husbands; yet hath he been bold even to claim that; as may be seen in the *Constit.* of Pope Greg. X. in one of their General Synods.

Heb. 3. 6. Mat. 10. 25.  
Eph. 4. 4. 2. 16. Rom. 12. 5.  
1 Cor. 12. 13. Eph. 1. 22. 4. 15. 5. 23.  
Col. 1. 18. Hof. 1. 11. One Head.

Joh. 3. 29. Eph. 5. 23.  
2 Cor. 11. 2. *evi dndei.*

*Sext. Decret. lib. 1. tit. 6. cap. 3.*

It seemeth therefore a Sacrilegious arrogance (derogating from our Lord's Honour) for any man to assume or admit those Titles of Sovereign of the Church, Head of the Church, our Lord, Arch-Pastor, Highest-Priest, Chief Doctor, Master, Father, Judge of Christians; upon what pretence, or under what distinction soever:

these pompatick, foolish, proud, perverse, wicked, profane words; these names of singularity, elation, vanity, blasphemy; (to borrow the Epithets with

*Vid. Greg. I. Epist. lib. 4. Ep. 32. 34.  
36. 38. 39. lib. 6. Ep. 24, 28, 30, 31. lib. 7.  
Epist. 70.*

which Pope Gregory I. doth brand the Titles of Universal Bishop, and Oecumenical Patriarch, no less modest in sound, and far more innocent in meaning, than those now ascribed to the Pope) are therefore to be rejected; not only because they are injurious to all other Pastors, and to the People of God's heritage; but because they do encroach upon our only Lord, to whom they do only belong; much more to usurp the things, which they do naturally signify, is a horrible invasion upon our Lord's Prerogative.

Thus hath that great Pope taught us to argue, in words expressly condemning some, and consequently all of them, together with the things which they signify: *What (saith he, writing to the Bishop of Constantinople, who had admitted the title of Universal Bishop or Patriarch) wilt thou say to Christ the Head of the Universal Church, in the trial of the last Judgment, who by the appellation of UNIVERSAL dost endeavour to subject all his Members to thee? whom I pray dost thou mean to imitate in so perverse a word, but him who despising the Legions of Angels*

*Tu quid Christo Universalis Ecclesia capies in extremi judicii dicturus examine, qui cuncta ejus Membra tibi imponere Universalis appellatione supponere? quis rogo in hoc eam perverso vocabulo nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui despectis Angelorum Legionibus secum constitutus*

et aliter constitutus ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli subesse, & solus omnibus præesse videretur: qui etiam dixit, In cælum conscendam, super astra cæli exaltabo solium meum — quid enim fratres tui omnes Universalis Ecclesie Episcopi, nisi astra cæli sunt? quibus dum cupi temetipsum vocabulo elationis præponere, eorumque nomen tui comparatione calcare — Greg. Ep. 4. 38.

on their name in comparison to thee, what dost thou say, but I will climb into heaven? —

Faustantiam sumpsit ita ut universa sibi tentet adscribere, & omnia quæ soli uni capiti cohererent, videlicet Christo, per elationem pompatici sermonis ejusdem Christi sibi studeat membra subjugare. Gr. M. Ep. 4. 36.

The same words we have in the Epistle of P. Pelagius (Predecessor of St. Gregory) to the Bishops of Constantinople (P. Pelagii Ep. 8.)

Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se

Again, I confidently say, that whoever doth call himself Universal Bishop, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation forerun Antichrist, because he proudly doth set himself before all others.

Universalem Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit. (Greg. I. lib. 6. Ep. 30.) Nec dispari superbiâ ad errorem ducitur; quia sicut perversus ille Deus videri vult super omnes homines; ita quisquis est, qui solus Sacerdos appellari appetit, super cæteros Sacerdotes se extollit. (ad Mauric. Aug.)

If these Argumentations be found, or signify any thing, what is the pretence of Universal Sovereignty and Pastorship, but a piece of Luciferian arrogance? who can imagine, that even this Pope could approve, could assume, could exercise it? if he did, was he not monstrously senseless and above measure impudent to use such discourses, which so plainly, without altering a word, might be retorted upon him; which are built upon suppositions that it is unlawful and wicked to assume Superiority over the Church, over all Bishops, over all Christians; the which indeed (seeing never Pope was of greater repute, or did write in any case more solemnly and seriously) have given to the pretences of his Successors so deadly a wound, that no balm of Sophistical interpretation can be able to heal it.

Vid. P. Pelag. Ep. 3.

We see that according to St. Gregory M. our Lord Christ is the one only Head of the Church; to whom for company let us adjoin St. Basil M. (that we may have both Greek and Latin for it,) who saith, that (according to Saint Paul) we are the body of Christ, and members one of another, because it is manifest, that the one and sole truly head, which is Christ, doth hold and connect each one to another unto concord.

Κεφάλαιος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ σώματος μέλη ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλήλων, ὅτι φανερόν ἐστιν ὅτι ὁ ἕνα καὶ ὁ ἀληθὴς κεφαλὴ, ὁ Χριστός, ἔχει καὶ συνδέει ἕνα ἓν ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλήλους εἰς concordiam.

Bas. M. de Jud. div. Tom. 2. p. 261.

Totus Christus Caput & Corpus est; Caput unigenitus Dei Filius, & corpus ejus Ecclesie, Sponsus & Sponsa, duo in carne una. Quicumque de ipso Capite ab Scripturis Sanctis dissentiunt, etiam in omnibus locis intermanant in quibus Ecclesia designata est, non sunt in Ecclesia, &c. Aug. de Univ. Eccl. cap. 4. Vid. contra Petil. 3. 42.

Whole Christ is the Head of the Body; the Head the only begotten Son of God, and his Body the Church, the Bridegroom and the Spouse, two in one flesh. Whoever disagree about the Head it self from the Holy Scriptures though they are found in all places, in which the Church is designed, they are not in the Church, &c.

It was unhappily expressed by Bellarmine — Ecclesia secuso etiam Christus unum Caput habere debet. De Pont. R. 1. 9. 5. Ac ne forte. The Church even Christ himself being set aside, ought to have one Head.

To decline these allegations of Scripture, they have forged distinctions, of several kinds of Churches, and several sorts of Heads; the which evasions I shall not particularly discourse, seeing it may suffice to observe



observe in general, that no such distinctions have any place or any ground in Scripture; nor can well consist with it; which simply doth represent the Church as one Kingdom, *a Kingdom of Heaven, a Kingdom not of this world*; all the Subjects whereof have their πολιτεία in heaven, or are considered as members of a City there; so that it is vain to seek for a Sovereign thereof in this world; the which also doth to the Catholick Church sojourning on earth usually impart the name and attributes properly appertaining to the Church most universal (comprehensive of all Christians in heaven and upon earth) because that is a visible representative of this, and we by joining in offices of piety with that do communicate with this; whence that which is said of one (concerning the Unity of its King, its Head, its Pastor, its Priest) is to be understood of the other; especially considering that our Lord, according to his promise, is ever present with the Church here, governing it by the efficacy of his Spirit and Grace, so that no other corporeal or visible Head of this Spiritual Body is needful.

*suā & prapositiones ipsos, & Ecclesiam cum prapositione gubernat.* Cyr. Ep. 69. Christ by his own arbitrement and power, and presence, governs both the Bishops themselves, and the Church with the Bishops.

It was to be sure a visible Headship, which St. Gregory did so eagerly impugn and exclaim against; for he could not apprehend the Bishop of Constantinople so wild, as to affect a Jurisdiction over the Church mystical or invisible.

2. Indeed upon this very account the Romish pretence doth not well accord with Holy Scripture, because it transformeth the Church into another kind of Body, than it was constituted by God, according to the representation of it in Scripture; for there it is represented as a spiritual and heavenly Society, compacted by the bands of *one faith, one hope, one Spirit* of Charity; but this pretence turneth it into a worldly frame; united by the same bands of interest and design, managed in the same manner, by terror and allurements, supported by the same props of force, of policy, of wealth, of reputation and splendor, as all other secular Corporations are.

*membra nos voluit, ut per compagem charitatis & fidei unum nos in se corpus efficeret.* Greg. M. Ep. 7. 111. Our Head, which is Christ, would therefore have us to be his members, that by the conjunction of charity and faith he might make us to be one body.

You may call it what you please, but it is evident that in truth the Papal Monarchy is a temporal Dominion, driving on worldly ends by worldly means; such as our Lord did never mean to institute; so that the Subjects thereof may with far more reason, than the People of Constantinople had, when their Bishop Nestorius did stop some of their Priests from contradicting him, say *\* We have a King, a Bishop we have not*; so that upon every Pope we may charge that, whereof *Anthimus* was accused, in the Synod of Constantinople, under *Menas*; that he did account the greatness and dignity of the Priesthood to be not a spiritual charge of souls, but as a kind of politic rule.

This was that, which seeming to be affected by the Bishop of Antioch, in encroachment upon the Church of Cyprus, the Fathers of the Ephesine Synod did endeavour to nip; enacting a Canon against all such invasions, lest under pretext of holy discipline the pride of worldly autho-

\* Βασιλέα ἔχοντες, Ἐπίσκοπον οὐκ ἔχοντες. Conc. Eph. part. cap. 30.

Τὸ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς μὴ δέσβειν ἐν πολιτικῇ ἀρχῇ, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῇ. Conc. sub Men. Act 1. pag. 9.

Μὴδὲ ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῇ ἀρχῇ ἐξουσίαν πολιτικῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Can. Eph. 1. Can. 8.

\* This was that which, about the same time the Fathers of the African Synod do request P. Celestine to forbear; — *nec permittere, ut fumum mundi fastum Christi Ecclesie inducere videamur. Conc. Afr. ad P. Celest. 1.*

Τὸν Ποιμενὶν Ἐποσκοῦντις ὁμοίως τῇ Ἀ-  
λῆξανδρίῳ πρεβ. ἡ ἰσχυρὸν ἐντὶ δυνάμεϊ  
πᾶσι ἀντιπαραστήσας. Socr. 7. 11.

3: This pretence doth thwart the Scripture by destroying that brotherly co-ordination and equality, which our Lord did appoint among the Bishops, and chief Pastors of his Church: He did (as we before shewed) prohibit all his Apostles to assume any domination, or authoritative Superiority over one another; the which command, together with others concerning the Pastoral function, we may well suppose to reach their Successors; so did St. Hieron suppose, collecting thence that all Bishops by original Institution are equals, or that no one by our

Ubiunque fuerit Episcopus sive Rome, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegi, sive Alexandria, sive Thani, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem & Sacerdotii; potentia divitiarum & paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit; ceterum omnes Apostolorum Successores sunt. Hier. Ep. 85. (ad Evagr.)

Bishop of Eugubium to be inferior to him of Rome, as being no less a successor of the Apostles than he? doth he not say these words, in way of proof, that the authority of the Roman Bishop or Church was of no

Si auctoritas queritur, orbis major est urbe; Ubiunque, &c.

validity against the practice of other Bishops and Churches? (upon occasion of Deacons there taking upon them more than in other places, as Cardinal Deacons do now) which excludeth such distinctions, as Scholastical fancies have devised to shift off his Testimony; the which he uttered simply, never dreaming of such distinctions.

• Illud appetunt unde omnibus digniores videantur. Gr. Ep. 4. 34.

Quia superbiendo se ceteris preponit. Ep. 6. 38.

Super ceteros Sacerdotes se extollit. Ib. Cupis Episcoporum nomen tui comparatione calcare. Ep. 4. 38.

Cuncta ejus membra tibi met comaris supponere. Ib.

(Invigiletur ergo ut omnibus co-Episcopis nostris & fratribus innotescat. P. Corn. apud Cyp. Ep. 48.)

the original equality among Bishops; notwithstanding some differences in order and Privileges, which their See had obtained. And that this was the general sense of the Fathers we shall afterward shew.

Hence, when it was objected to them, that they did affect Superiority, they did sometimes disclaim it; so did Pope Gelasius I. (a zealous

Hic non tam optamus preponi aliis, (sicut prae-dicas) quam cum fidelibus cunctis sanctum & Dei placitum habere consortium. P. Gelasius I. Ep. 9. (ad Euphem. Ep. CP.)

rity should creep in; \*and what pride of that kind could they mean beyond that which now the Popes do claim and exercise? Now, do I say, after that the Papal Empire hath swollen to such a bulk; whereas so long ago, when it was but in its bud and stripling age, it was observed of it by a very honest Historian, that the Roman Episcopacy had long since advanced into a high degree of power beyond the Priesthood.

Where-ever (saith he) a Bishop is, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thani, he is of the same worth, and of the same Priesthood; the Power of wealth, or lowness of poverty, do not make a Bishop higher or lower, but all are Successors of the Apostles; where, doth not he plainly deny the

This consequence St. Gregory did suppose, when he therefore did condemn the Title of Universal Bishop, because it did imply an affectation of Superiority and dignity in one Bishop above others; of abasing the name of other Bishops in comparison of his own, of extolling himself above the rest of Priests, &c.

This the ancient Popes did remember, when usually in their compellation of any Bishop, they did style them Brethren, Colleagues, fellow-Ministers fellow-Bishops, not intending thereby complement or mockery, but to declare their sense of

Here we do not so much desire to be advanced above others, as together with all the faithful to make up a comfort holy and well-pleasing to God.

4. This pretence doth thwart the Holy Scripture, not only by trampling down the dignity of Bishops, (which according to St. Gregory doth imply great pride and presumption) but as really infringing the Rights granted by our Lord to his Church, and the Governors of it.

*præbetur.* Greg. 7. 30. (p. 451.) What is yielded to another more than reason requires, is taken from you. *Παύλος* — *ἡ πύξιν ἐκδοῦναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ* Syn. Eph. I. Can. 8. A thing that entrencheth upon the freedom of all others.

For to each Church our Lord hath imposed a Duty, and imparted a Power of maintaining divine Truth, and so approving it self a pillar and support of truth: Of deciding Controversies possible and proper to be decided with due temper, ultimately without farther resort; for that he, who will not obey or acquiesce in its Decision, is to be as a heathen or publican: Of censuring and rejecting Offenders (in Doctrine, or De-meanor;) Those within (saith Saint Paul to the Church of Corinth) do not ye judge? But them that are without God judgeth; wherefore put away from among your selves that wicked person: Of preserving Order and Decency; according to that Rule, prescribed to the Church of Corinth, let all things be done decently and in order: Of promoting Edification: Of deciding Causes.

1 Cor. 14. 40. 1 Thess. 5. 14. Rom. 14. 19. 1 Cor. 6. 1. —

All which Rights and Privileges the Roman Bishop doth bereave the Churches of, snatching them to himself; pretending that he is the Sovereign Doctor, Judge, Regulator of all Churches; over-ruling and voiding all that is done by them; according to his pleasure.

The Scripture hath enjoined and empowered all Bishops to feed, guide, and rule their respective Churches, as the Ministers, Stewards, Ambassadors, Angels of God; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edification of the Body of Christ: To whom God hath committed the care of their People, so that they are responsible for their Souls.

Act. 20. 28. Heb. 13. 17.  
1 Pet. 5. 2. 1 Tim. 3. 15.  
Tit. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 12. 28.  
Eph. 4. 11. Apoc. 2. 27.  
Eph. 4. 12.  
Heb. 13. 17.

All which Rights and Privileges of the Episcopal Office the Pope hath invaded, doth obstruct, cram, frustrate, destroy; pretending (without any warrant) that their Authority is derived from him; forcing them to exercise it no otherwise, than as his Subjects, and according to his pleasure. But of this Point more afterward.

*Dei & Apostolicæ sedis gratia.*  
*Vid. post.*  
*Superbum*

*nimis est & immoderatum ultra fines proprias tendere, & antiquitate calcata alienum jus velle præripere, atque ut unius crescat dignitas, tot Metropolitānorum impugnare primatus.* Sc. P. Leo I. Ep. 55.

'Tis too proud and unreasonable a thing for one to stretch himself beyond his bounds, and maugre all antiquity to snatch away other mens right, and that the dignity of one may be enhanced, to oppose the primacies of so many Metropolitans.

5. This pretence doth thwart the Scripture, by robbing all Christian People of the Liberties, and Rights, with which by that Divine Character they are endow'd; and which they are obliged to preserve inviolate.

*Sanctæ Ecclesiæ universali injuriam facit.* Greg. I. Ep. 1. 24.  
It does wrong to the Holy Catholick Church.  
*Plebis Majestas.* Cyr. Ep. 55. (ad Corn. P.) p. 117.

Saint Paul enjoyneth the Galatians to stand fast in the liberty, where-with Christ hath made us free; and not to be entangled again with the yoke



Gal. 5. 1.  
Col. 2. 16,  
18.

of bondage; there is therefore a liberty, which we must maintain, and a power to which we must not submit; and against whom can we have more ground to do this, than against him, who pretendeth to dogmatize, to define Points of Faith, to impose Doctrines (new and strange enough) on our Consciences, under a peremptory obligation of yielding assent to them? to prescribe Laws, as divine and necessary to be observed, without warrant, as those Dogmatists did, against whom Saint Paul biddeth us to maintain our Liberty: (so that if he should declare *vertue to be vice, and white to be black, we must believe him,* some of his Adherents have said, consistently enough with his pretences;) for,

P. Leo I.  
Ep. 28.

Against such tyrannical Invaders we are bound to maintain our Liberty, according to that Precept of Saint Paul; the which if a Pope might well alledge against the proceedings of a General Synod; with much more reason may we thereby justify our non-submission to one man's exorbitant domination.

2 Cor. 1.  
24.

This is a Power, which the Apostles themselves did not challenge to themselves, for *We* (saith Saint Paul) *have not dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy.*

1 Cor. 10.  
15. 7. 12,  
25. 40.

They did not pretend, that any Christian should absolutely believe them, in cases, wherein they had not Revelation (general, or special) from God; in such cases referring their Opinion to the judgment and discretion of Christians.

Gal. 1. 8.

They say, *Though we or an Angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed; If any man, &c.* which Precept, with many others of the like purport, (injoyning us to examine the truth, to adhere unto the received Doctrine, to decline heterodoxies and novelties) doth signify nothing, if every Christian hath not allowed to him a judgment of discretion, but is tied blindly to follow the dictates of another.

St. Austin (I am sure) did think this liberty such, that without betraying it no man could be obliged to believe any thing not grounded upon Canonical Authority: for to a Donatist his Adversary, citing the

*Nunc vero quoniam Canonicum non est quod recitas, cā libertate ad quam nos vocavit Dominus, ejus viri, cujus laudem consequi non valeo, cujus multis literis Scripta mea non comparo, cujus ingenium diligo, cujus ore dilector, cujus charitatem miror, cujus martyrium veneror, hoc quod aliter sapuit non accipio. Aug. contr. Cresc. 2. 32.*

Authority of St. Cyprian against him; he thus replieth; *But now seeing it is not Canonical which thou recitest, with that liberty to which the Lord hath called us, I do not receive the opinion, differing from Scripture, of that man whose praise I cannot reach, to whose great learning I do not compare my writings, whose wit I love, in whose speech I delight, whose charity I admire, whose martyrdom I reverence.*

This Liberty not only the Ancients, but even divers Popes have acknowledged to belong to every Christian; as we shall hereafter shew, when we shall prove, that we may lawfully reject the Pope, as a Patron of Error and Iniquity.

6. It particularly doth thwart Scripture by wronging Princes in exempting a numerous sort of People from subjection to their Laws, and Judicature; whereas by God's Ordination and express Command *every soul is subject* to them; not excepting the Popes themselves; (in the opinion of St. Chrysostom, except they be greater than any Apostle.)

By pretending to govern the Subjects of Princes without their leave; to make Laws, without his permission or confirmation; to cite his Subjects out of their Territories, &c. which are encroachments upon the Rights of God's unquestionable Ministers.

III. Farther, because our Adversaries do little regard any allegation of Scripture against them (pretending themselves to be the only Masters of its sense, or of common sense, Judges and Interpreters of them) we do alledge against them, that this pretence doth also cross Tradition, and the common Doctrine of the Fathers. For,

1. Common usage and practice is a good interpreter of Right; and that sheweth no such Right was known in the Primitive Church —

2. Indeed the state of the Primitive Church did not admit it.

3. The Fathers did suppose no Order in the Church, by original Right, or divine Institution, superior to that of a Bishop; whence they commonly did style a Bishop the Highest Priest, and Episcopacy the top of Ecclesiastical Orders.

Ἡ Ἐπισκοπία τὴν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπίας ἐνέχμαυρον, &c. Const. Apost. 8. 46.

The chief Priest (saith Tertullian) that is the Bishop, hath the right of giving Baptism.

Although (saith St. Ambrose) the Presbyters also do it, yet the beginning of the Ministry is from the highest Priest.

Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos qui est Episcopus. Tert. de Bapt. c. 17.

Licet enim & Presbyteri faciant, tamen exordium Ministerii est à summo Sacerdote. Ambr. de Sacr. 3. 1. Suscepisti gubernacula summi Sacerdotis. Id. Ep. 5.

Optatus calleth Bishops, the tops and Princes of all.

Apices & Principes

omnium Sacerdotes. Opt. 1. Ecclesie salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet. Hier. c. Lucif. 4. The safety of the Church depends upon the dignity of the High priest.

Ego dignus summo Sacerdotio decernebar. Id. Ep. 99. (ad Afell.)

In Episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus Sacerdos est, hoc est Princeps Sacerdotum, & Propbeta & Evangelista, & cetera adimplenda officia Ecclesie in ministerio fidelium. Ambr. in Eph. 4. 11.

In the Bishop there are all Orders, because he is the first Priest, (i.e.) the Prince of Priests, and Prophet and Evangelist, and all other Offices of the Church, to be fulfilled in the ministry of the faithful.

The Divine Order of Bishops (saith Dionysius) is the first of Divine Orders; the same being also the extreme and last of them; for into it all the frame of our Hierarchy is resolved and accomplished.

Ἡ θεία ἡ ἱερωσύνη τῆς ἐκκλησίας, &c. supr. Pontifex princeps Sacerdotum est, quasi via sequentium; Ipse & summus Sacerdos, ipse & Pontifex maximus nuncupatur. Ibid. Hisp. apud Grat. dist. 21. cap. 1.

This language is common even among Popes themselves, complying with the speech then current; for, Presbyters (saith Pope Innocent I.) although they are Priests, yet have they not the top of High-priesthood.

Nam Presbyteri, licet sint Sacerdotes,

pontificatus tamen apicem non habent. P. Innoc. I. Ep. 1. (ad Decent.) — dum facile imponuntur manus, dum negligenter summus Sacerdos eligitur. Id. Ep. 12. (ad Aurel.)

No man (saith P. Zosimus I.) against the precepts of the Fathers should presume to aspire to the highest Priesthood of the Church.

Nè quis contra Patrum præcepta — (ad summum Ecclesie Sacerdotium aspirare præsumeret. P. Zoz. I. Ep. 1. ad Helych.)

It is decreed (saith Pope Leo I.) that the Chorepiscopi or Presbyters, who figure the sons of Aaron, shall not presume to snatch that, which the Princes of the Priests (whom Moses and Aaron did typify) are commanded to do. (Note by the way, that seeing according to this Pope's mind (after St. Hierom) Moses and Aaron did in the Jewish Policy represent Bishops, there was none there to prefigure the Pope.)

Ideoque id quod tantum facere Principibus Sacerdotum iustum est, quorum

typum Moses & Aaron tenuerunt, omnino decretum est, ut Chorepiscopi vel Presbyteri qui filiorum Aaron gestant figuram, arripere non præsumant. P. Leo. Ep. 88. Pontificatus apicem non habent. Ibid. Vid. Ep. 84. cap. 5.

S. Hier. ad Evagr. Ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, Quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi, Presbyteri & diaconi vindicant in Ecclesia. Or. 19. p. 309.

A Bishop called *deposed*.  
*Apost. Const. 8. 10, 12.*  
*Summus Christi Pontifex Augustinus.*  
*(Paulin. apud Aug. Ep. 36.) Aug. Ep. 35.*  
*Beatissimo Papæ Augustino. Hieron.*  
*(Aug. Ep. 11, 13, 14. &c.)*  
*Optamus te beatiss. & gloriosissime Papa*  
*in Domino semper valere. Ep. 31.*

In those days the Bishop of *Nazianzum* (a petty Town in *Cappadocia*) was an High-priest (so *Gregory* calleth his Father.) And the Bishop of a poor City in *Africk* is styled *Sovereign Pontif of Christ, most blessed Father, most blessed Pope*: and the very *Roman* Clergy doth call *St. Cyprian* *most blessed and most glorious Pope*; which Titles the Pope doth now so charily reserve and appropriate to himself.

But innumerable Instances of this kind might be produced; I shall only therefore add two other passages, which seem very observable, to the enforcement of this discourse.

*Apud nos Apostolorum locum Episcopi tenent, apud eos Episcopus tertius est; habent enim primos de Pepusa Phrygie Patriarchas, secundos quos appellant Cenones; atque ita in tertium, id est plenè ultimum locum Episcopi devolvuntur; quasi exinde ambitiosior religio fiat, si quod apud nos primum est, apud illos novissimum sit. Hier. (ad Marcellam) Ep. 54.*

*St. Hierome*, reprehending the discipline of the *Montanists* hath these words, *With us the Bishops do hold the places of the Apostles; with them, a Bishop is in the third place; for they have for the first rank the Patriarchs of Pepusa in Phrygia; for the second those whom they call Cenones; so are Bishops thrust down into the third, that is almost the last place; as if thence Religion became more stately, if that which is first with us, be the last with them.* Now

doth not *St. Hierom* here affirm, that every Bishop hath the place of an Apostle, and the first rank in the Church? doth not he tax the advancement of any Order above this? may not the Popish Hierarchy most patly be compared to that of the *Montanists*, and is it not equally liable to the censure of *St. Hierom*? doth it not place the *Roman Pope* in the first place, and the *Cardinals* in the second, detruing the Bishops into a third place? Could the *Pepusian* Patriarch, or his *Cenones*, either more over-top in dignity, or sway by power over Bishops, than doth the *Roman Patriarch* and his *Cardinals*?

— actum est de Episcopatus vigore, & de Ecclesie gubernanda sublimi, ac divina potestate. *Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad P. Cornel.)*

*Non iste ad Episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia Ecclesiastica officia promotus, & in divinis administrationibus Dominum sepe promeritus, ad Sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit. Cypr. Ep. 52.*

Again, *St. Cyprian* telleth *Pope Cornelius*, that in Episcopacy doth reside the sublime and divine power of governing the Church; it being the sublime top of the Priesthood: He (saith the Blessed man concerning *Pope Cornelius*) did not suddenly arrive to Episcopacy, but being through all Ecclesiastical Offices promoted, and having in divine Administrations often merited of God, did by all the steps of Religion mount to the sublimest pitch of Priesthood; where it is visible,

that *St. Cyprian* doth not reckon the *Papacy*, but the *Episcopacy* of *Cornelius* to be that top of Priesthood, (above which there was nothing eminent in the Church) unto which he passing through the inferior degrees of the Clergy had attained.

In fine, it cannot well be conceived, that the Ancients constantly would have spoken in this manner, if they had allowed the Papal Office to be such, as now it doth bear it self; the which indeed is an Order no less distant from Episcopacy, than the rank of a King differeth from that of the meanest Baron in his Kingdom.

Neither is it prejudicial to this Discourse (or to any preceeding) that in the primitive Church there were some distinctions and subordinations of Bishops (as of *Patriarchs, Primates, Metropolitans*, common Bishops) for,

The *Africans* had a particular care, that this Primacy should not degenerate into tyranny.

These



These were according to prudence constituted by the Church it self for the more orderly and peaceable administration of things.

These did not import such a difference among the Bishops, that one should domineer over others to the infringing of primitive fraternity, or common liberty: but a precedence in the same rank, with some moderate advantages for the common good.

These did stand under Authority of the Church; and might be changed, or corrected as was found expedient by common agreement.

By virtue of these the Superiours of this kind could do nothing over their subordinates in an arbitrary manner, but according to the regulation of Canons, established by consent in Synods; by which their influence was amplified or curb'd.

When any of these did begin to domineer, or exceed his limits, he was liable to account, and correction; he was exclaimed against as tyrannical.

When *Primates* did begin to swell and encroach, good men declared their displeasure at it, and wished it removed; as is known particularly by the famous *Wise* of \*Gregory Nazianzene.

O that there were not at all any Presidency, or any preference in place, and tyrannical prerogative.

But we are discoursing against a Superiority of a different nature, which foundeth it self in the Institution of *Christ*, imposeth it self on the Church, is not alterable or governable by it, can endure no check or control, pretendeth to be endowed with an absolute power to act without, or against the consent of the Church, is limited by no certain bounds but its own pleasure, &c.

IV. Farther this pretence may be impugned, by many Arguments springing from the nature and reason of things abstractedly considered; according to which the exercise of such an Authority may appear unpracticable without much iniquity, and great inconvenience, in prejudice to the rights of Christian States and People, to the interests of Religion and Piety, to the peace and welfare of Mankind; whence it is to be rejected as a pest of Chrirtendom.

1. Whereas all the world in design and obligation is Christian; (the utmost parts of the earth being granted in possession to our Lord; and his Gospel extending to every creature under heaven) and may in effect become such, when God pleaseth, by acceptance of the Gospel: whereas it may easily happen, that the most distant places on the Earth may embrace Christianity: whereas really Christian Churches have been and are dispersed all about the World; it is thence hugely incommodious, that all the Church should depend upon an Authority resident in one Place, and to be managed by one Person: the Church being such, is too immense, boundless, uncircumscribed, unwieldy a bulk to be guided by the inspection, or managed by the influence of one such Authority or Person.

If the whole World were reduced under the Government of one Civil Monarch, it would necessarily be ill governed, as to Policy, to Justice, to Peace: The skirts or remoter parts from the *Metropolis* or centre

*Conc. Ant. Can. 9.*

*Vid. Apost. Can. 34.*

*Conc. Carth. apud Cyp.*

*Cod. Afr. Can. 39.*

*Nestorius, Dioscorus.*

*Οἱ δὲ τὴν πρεσβυτερίαν τὰς φιλαρχίας ἐκείνους διακρίναντες.* Euseb. 8. 1.

So Eusebius complaineth of the Bishops in this time

So Isidor. Pelusiot. Ep. 20. 123. 4. 219.

\* *Ὅτι ἔφραστον γὰρ μὴδὲ ἂν πρεσβυτερία, μὴδὲ τις τὸν πᾶσι πρεσβυτεριστῶν, καὶ τυραννικὴ πρεσβυτερία.* Greg. Naz. Orat. 28.

So Socrates of the Bishop (not only of Rome, but) Alexandria. lib. 7. cap. 11.

So St. Chrysostom in 1 Tim. 3. 1. in Ep. Orat. 11.

So Greg. Naz. complained of πρεσβυτερία. Ibid.

*Psal. 2. 8.*

*Col. 1. 23.*

*Luke 24.*

*47.*

*Matt. 28.*

*19.*

centre of the Government would extremely suffer thereby; for they would feel little light or warmth from Majesty shining at such a distance: They would live under small awe of that Power, which was so far out of sight: They must have very difficult recourse to it for redress of grievances, and relief of oppressions: for final decision of causes, and composure of differences; for correction of offences, and dispensation of justice, upon good information, with tolerable expedition: It would be hard to preserve peace or quell seditions, and suppress insurrections that might arise in distant quarters.

Cum tot  
justitiis,  
& tanta  
negotia so-  
lus, &c.  
Hor. Ep.  
1.1.

Εἴτε δὲ  
ἐπὶ δούλῳ,  
Ζολ. Hist.  
1. (p. 4.  
Steph.)

What man could obtain the knowledge or experience needful skilfully and justly to give Laws, or administer Judgment to so many Nations different in Humour, in Language, in Customs? What mind of man, what industry, what leisure could serve to sustain the burthen of that care, which is needful to the wielding such an Office? How and when should one man be able to receive all the addresses, to weigh all the cases, to make all the resolutions and dispatches requisite for such a charge? If the burthen of one small Kingdom be so great, that wise and good Princes do groan under its weight, what must that be of all Mankind? To such an extent of Government there must be allowed a Majesty, and power correspondent, the which cannot be committed to one hand, without its degeneration into extreme Tyranny. The words of *Zozimus* to this purpose are observable; who saith, that the *Romans* by admitting *Augustus Caesar* to the Government, did do very perillously; for, If he should chuse to manage the Government rightly and justly, he would not be capable of applying himself to all things as were fit; not being able to succour those, who do lie at greatest distance; nor could he find so many Magistrates, as would not be ashamed to defeat the opinion conceived of them; nor could he sute them to the differences of so many manners: Or, if transgressing the bounds of Royalty, he should warp to Tyranny, disturbing the Magistracies, overlooking misdemeanors, bartering right for money, holding the Subjects for Slaves, (such as most Emperors, or rather near all have been, few excepted) then it is quite necessary, that the brutish Authority of the Prince should be a publick calamity, for then flatterers being by him dignified with gifts and honours do invade the greatest commands; and those who are modest and quiet, not affecting the same life with them, are consequently displeased, not enjoying the same advantages; so that from hence Cities are filled with seditions and troubles. And the Civil and Military employments being delivered up to avaritious Persons, do both render a peaceable life sad and grievous to men of better disposition, and do enfeeble the resolution of Soldiers in war.

Felicio-  
ribus sic re-  
bus huma-  
nis omnia

Regna parva essent, concordia vicinitate letantia. Aug. de Civ. D. 4. 15. Ἐστὶ τι καὶ πλάσι μάλιστα μίτον. ὡς πο-  
καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντων, ζώων, φυτῶν, ὀρεῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἵκασιν ἔτι λίαν μικρὸν, ἔτι καὶ μέγα καὶ ὑπεράλλον ἔχει  
αὐτὰ δινομεῖν. Arilt. Pol. 7. 4. There is a certain measure of greatness fit for Cities and Commonwealths, as well as  
for all other things. Living Creatures, Plants, Instruments, for every one of these hath its proper virtue and faculty,  
when it is neither very little, nor yet exceeds in bigness. Τίς δὲ στρατὸς ἔστι τοῦ λίαν ὑπερέχοντος πλάτους, ἢ  
τῆς κήρυς μὴ συντόπου; Ibid. For who would be a Captain of an excessive huge multitude, &c.

Suis & ipsa Roma viribus ruit. Hor.  
Ep. 16.

—qua ab exiguis initiiis creveris ut,  
jam magnitudine labores sua. Liv. 1.

Ac nescio an satius fuerit populo Roma-  
no Sicilia & Africa contentos fuisse, aut  
his etiam ipsis carere dominantibus in Italia  
sua, quam eo magnitudinis crescere, ut  
viribus suis conficeretur. Flor. 3. 12.

It is commonly observed by Historians, that *Rome* growing in bigness, did labour therewith, and was not able to support it self; many distempers and disorders springing up in so vast a body, which did throw it into continual pangs, and at length did bring it to ruin; for *Them* (with *St. Austin* concerning the times of *Pompey*)

pey) Rome had subdued Africk, it had subdued Greece; and widely also ruling over other parts, as not able to bear it self, did in a manner by its own greatness break it self.

Tunc jam Roma subjugaverat Africam, subjugaverat Græciam, atq; etiam aliis paribus imperans tanquam seipsam ferre non valens se sua quodammodo magnitudine fegerat. Aug. de Civ. D. 13. 45. Tac. Hist. 2. p. 476.

Hence that wise Prince *Augustus Caesar* did himself forbear to enlarge the Roman Dominion, and did in his Testament advise the Senate to do the like.

Γνώμην τε αὐτοῖς ἐδύκατο τε

ἀπαθῆναι, καὶ μὴδε μᾶλλον πλεῖστον ἢ ἀρχὴν ἐπαυξήσαι ἐθέλῃσαι. Δυσφύλακτον τε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἔσθαι ἔφη· τὸτο γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔτατο· αἰεὶ ποτε ἐ λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐργῳ ἐτήρησε· πικρὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ πολλὰ ἐκ τῆς βαρβαρικῆς περσικῆς αἰχμῆς, καὶ ἡθελῆσε. Dion. lib. 56. Tac. Ann. 1.

He advised them to be content with what they had, and by no means to endeavour the enlargement of their Empire, for, said he, it will be hardly kept; and this he himself observ'd not in word only, but in deed: for when he might have gotten more from the barbarous Nations, yet he would not.

*Ipse nocet moles, utinam remeare liceret Ad veteres fines, & mania pauperis Ancis, &c.* Claud de bello Gildon.

To the like inconveniencies (and much greater in its kind; Temporal things being more easily ordered than Spiritual, and having secular Authority, great advantages of power and wealth to aid it self) must the Church be obnoxious, if it were subjected to the government of one Sovereign, unto whom the maintenance of Faith, the protection of Discipline, the determination of Controversies, the revision of Judgments, the discussion and final decision of Causes upon appeal, the suppression of Disorders and Factions, the inspection over all Governors, the correction of Misdemeanors, the constitution, relaxation and abolition of Laws, the resolution of all matters concerning Religion and the publick State in all Countries must be referred.

τίς πρὸς ταῦτα ἰκανός; what Shoulders can bear such a charge without perpetual miracle? (and yet we do not find that the Pope hath any promise of miraculous assistance, nor in his demeanor doth appear any mark thereof:) what mind would not the care of so many affairs utterly distract, and overwhelm? who could find time to cast a glance on each of so numberless particulars? what sagacity of wit, what variety of learning, what penetrancy of judgment, what strength of memory, what indefatigable vigour of industry, what abundance of experience would suffice for enabling one man to weigh exactly all the controversies of Faith, and cases of Discipline perpetually starting up in so many Regions?

The Synod of Basil doth well describe the duty of a Pope, but it is infinitely hard to practise it in any measure. (Conc. Bas. Sess. 23. p. 64, &c. —)

What reach of skill and ability would serve for accommodation of Laws to different humours and fashions of so many Nations? Shall a decrepit old man in the decay of his age, parts, vigour — (such as Popes, usually are) undertake this? May we not say to him, as *Jethro* did to *Moses*, *Ultra vires tuas est negotium*; The thing thou doest is not good; thou wilt surely wear away, both thou and this People that is with thee; for this thing is too heavy for thee; thou art not able to perform it thy self alone.

Ex. 18. 18.

If the care of a small Diocesis hath made the most able and industrious Bishops (who had a Conscience and sense of their duty) to groan under its weight, how insupportable must such a thing be?

The care of his own particular Church, if he would act the part of a Bishop indeed, would sufficiently take up the Pope; especially in some times; whenas Pope *Alex.* saith, — *Ut intestina nostræ specialis* (Epist. ad Ecclesie negotia vix possemus ventilare, nedum longinqua ad plenum extricare.

P. Alex. II. Ger. Rhem. Bin. p.

If 284.)



2 Cor. 11.  
18.

If it be said, that Saint *Paul* testifyeth of himself, that he had a care of all the Churches incumbent on him; I answer, that he (and other Apostles had the like) questionless had a pious sollicitude for the welfare of all Christians, especially of the Churches which he had founded, being vigilant for occasions to edify them; but what is this to bearing the charge of a standing government over all the Churches diffused through the world? that care of a few Churches then was burthenfom to him, what is the charge of so many now? to one seldom endowed with such Apostolical graces and gifts as Saint *Paul* was.

How weak must the influence of such an Authority be upon the circumferential Parts of its Oecumenical Sphere?

How must the outward branches of the Churches faint and fade for want of sap from the root of Discipline, which must be conveyed through so many obstructions to such a distance?

Tanta me  
occupatio-  
num onera  
deprimunt,  
ut

ad superna animus nullatenus erigatur. Sc. Greg. I. lib. 1. Ep. 7. 25. 5.

Such a weight of employment presses me down, that my mind can by no means be rais'd to things above.

Si administratio illius temporis Mare fuit, quid de presenti Papatu dicendum erit? Calv. Inst. 4. c. 7. 22.

If the ordering of affairs in those times was a boundless Sea, what shall we say of the present Papacy?

How difficult, how impossible will it be for him there to receive faithful information, or competent testimony, whereupon to ground just decisions of Causes?

How will it be in the power thence of any malicious and cunning person to raise trouble against innocent persons? for any like person to decline the due Correction laid on him? by transferring the Cause from home to such a distance?

How much cost, how much trouble, how much hazard must parties concerned be at to fetch light and justice thence?

Put case a Heresy, a Schism, a Doubt or Debate of great moment should arise in *China*, how should the Gentleman in *Italy* proceed to confute that Heresy, to quash that Schism, to satisfy that Doubt, to determine that Cause? how long must it be e'er he can have notice thereof? to how many cross accidents of weather and way must the transmitting of information be subject? how difficult will it prove to get a clear and sure knowledge concerning the state of things?

How hard will it be to get the opposite parties to appear, so as to confront testimonies and probations requisite to a fair and just decision? how shall witnesses of infirm sex or age ramble so far? how easily will some of them prepossess and abuse him with false suggestions and misrepresentations of the case? how slippery therefore will the result be, and how prone he to award a wrongful sentence?

Nunquid  
miran-  
dum est  
de tam

longinquis terris Episcopos tuos tibi narrare impune quod volunt? Aug. contra Crescon. 3. 34. What marvel if the Bishops from so remote Countries tell you what they please without check or control?

Delungas  
vias luen-  
gas men-  
sas. Hisp.  
Prov. Syn.  
Basil. Sess.  
31. p. 86.

How tedious, how expensive, how troublesome, how vexatious, how hazardous must this course be to all parties? Certainly Causes must needs proceed slowly, and depend long; and in the end the resolution of them must be very uncertain.

What temptation will it be for any one (how justly soever corrected by his immediate Superiors) to complain; hoping thereby to escape, to disguise the truth, &c. who being condemned will not appeal to one at a distance, hoping by false suggestions to delude him?

This

This necessarily will destroy all Discipline, and induce impunity, or frustration of Justice. Vid. Bern.  
Ep. 178. de  
Consi.

Certainly much more convenient and equal it should be, that there should be near at hand a Sovereign Power, fully capable, expeditely and seasonably to compose differences; to decide causes, to resolve doubts, to settle things without more stir and trouble.

Very equal it is, that Laws should rather be framed, interpreted and executed in every Countrey, with accommodation to the tempers of the People, to the circumstances of things, to the Civil State there, by persons acquainted with those particulars, than by strangers ignorant of them, and apt to mistake about them.

How often will the Pope be imposed upon, as he was in the case of *Basilides*, of whom *St. Cyprian* saith, *going to Rome he deceived our Colleague Stephen, being placed at distance, and ignorant of the fact, and concealed truth, aspiring to be unjustly restored to the Bishoprick, from which he was justly removed.*

As he was in the case of *Marcellus*, who gull'd Pope *Julius* by fair professions, as *St. Basil* doth often complain.

As he was in aiding that versatile and troublesome Bishop, *Eustathius* of *Sebastia*, to the recovery of his Bishoprick. Basil. Ep. 73.  
74

As he was in rejecting the man of God, and most admirable Bishop, *Meletius*; and admitting scandalous reports about him, which the same Saint doth often resent; blaming sometimes the fallacious misinformation, sometimes the wilful presumption, negligence, pride of the *Roman Church*, in the case.

*Romam pergens Stephanum Collegam nostrum longe positum, & gesta rei, ac tacite veritatis ignarum fefellit; ut ex ambiret reponi se injuste in Episcopatum, de quo fuerat justè depositus. Cypri. Ep. 67.*

*Ἐκείνα πῶσι νῦν ἃ πείσονται Μαρκιανῶν. πρὸς μὲν τὴν ἀληθείαν αὐτοῖς ἀπαγγέλλοντας φιλονεικήσαντες, &c. Basil. Ep. 10.*

*Τὸ ἀνθρώπου τῷ θεῷ Μελετίῳ — τὸ Σαμασιώτητον ἐπίσκοπον τὸ ἀληθινὸς τὸ θεῷ Ἐκκλησίας Μελετίον — Basil. Ep. 349.*

*Ἰδοὺ οἱ ἢ τὴν ἀρετὴν εἰδέναι φιλονεικῶντες μᾶλλον ἢ ἀληθεύοντες αὐτοῖς ἐγγίνον. Ibid.*

Some are altogether ignorant of what is here done, others that think they know them declare them unto us, more contentiously than truly.

*Ἐλύπησ' ἡμᾶς λέγων τοῖς Ἀρειομανεῖσι συγκαταβιβαῖν τοῦ Διοφιλῆστους ἀδελφοῦ ἡμῶν Μελετίου καὶ Εὐσεβίου. Epist. 321. ad Pet. Alex.*

He grieved us when he said, that our godly Brethren, *Meletius* and *Eusebius*, were reckoned among the *Arians*. Ibid.

*Πόσα βοήθεια ἡμῶν τὸν Διττικὸν ὄρεται, οἱ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἔτι ἴσασιν. ὅτε μαθῶν ἀνέχον; Basil. Ep. 10.*

What help can we have from the pride of the *Africans*, who neither know the truth, nor endure to learn it?

As he was in the case of *Pelagius* and *Celestius*, who did cajole Pope *Zosimus* to acquit them, to condemn *Eros* and *Lazarus* their accusers, to reprove the *African Bishops* for prosecuting them. P. Zoz. 1.  
Ep. 3 & 4.

How many proceedings should we have like to that of Pope *Zozimus I.* concerning that scandalous Priest, *Apiarius*; whom being for grievous crimes excommunicated by his Bishop, that Pope did admit to communion, and undertake to patronize; but was baffled in his enterprize. Deinde  
quod inter  
tantam

*hominum, multitudinem aded pauci sunt Episcopi, & ampla singulorum Parochie, ut in subjectis plebibus curam Episcopalis officii nullatenus exequi, aut ritè administrare valeant. P. Greg. VII. Ep. 2. 73.*

And then because in so great a multitude of People there are so few Bishops, and every one's Diocese very large, that they are in no-wise able to execute or rightly perform the charge of the Episcopal office among the People over whom they are set.

This hath been the sense of the Fathers, in the case.

*St. Cyprian* therefore saith, that seeing it was a general statute among the *Cyprian Bishops*, and that it was both equal and just, that every one's cause should be heard there, where the crime was committed; and that each Pastor had a

portion of the Flock allotted to him, which he should rule and govern, being to render unto the Lord an account of his doing.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ  
ἀνέλεον  
τοῦ ἡγίου  
Αἰγυπτίου  
τῆς ἐκ

St. Chrysostom thought it improper that one out of Egypt should administer justice to Persons in Thrace: (and why not as well as one out of Italy?)

Θεσμὸν διὰ τὸν. Chrys. Ep. 102. (ad P. Innoc. I.) Εἰ γὰρ οὕτω κρατήσῃ τὸ ἡθὺς, καὶ οὕτως ᾤοντο τοῖς βυζαντινοῖς; εἰς ἀλλοτείας ἀπὸ πανταχοῦ ἐκ ποσῶν διασπασμάτων, καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἕως ἀν' ἰδίῳ πρὸς, ἵνα ὅτι πάντα οἰχόμενοι, &c.

For if this custom prevail, and if they that will may go to other mens Dioceses at so great a distance, and eject whom any man pleases, know that all will go to wrack, &c.

Decreta  
Nicensi  
ve inferioris  
gradus  
clericos,

The African Synod thought the Nicene Fathers had provided most prudently and most justly, that all affairs should be finally determined there where they did arise.

sive ipsos Episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt; Prudentissime enim justissimeque viderunt (providenter) quaecunque negotia in suis locis, ubi orsa sunt, finienda. Ep. Conc. Afric. ad P. Celest. I. (in fine Cod. Afric.) vel apud Dion. Exig.

Aut quomodo ipsum transmarinum iudicium

They thought a transmarine judgment could not be firm, because the necessary persons for testimony, for the infirmity of sex or age, or for many other infirmities could not be brought thither.

raturum erit, ad quod testium necessaria persona vel propter sexum, vel propter senectutis infirmitatem, vel multis aliis impedimentis adduci non poterunt. Ibid.

Nè ergo  
(quod inter longin-  
quas regi-  
ones acci-  
dere solet)

Pope Leo himself saw how dilatory this course would be; and that longinquity of region doth cause the examination of truth to become over dilatory.

in nimias dilationes tenderent veritatis examina — P. Leo I. Ep. 34.

Τότε ἐπὶ  
τῇ Ἀλεξ-  
ανδρείᾳ οἱ  
πάντες  
ἀπαρτίθ-  
ονται. Ἐνθα ὁ ἐγκλησάμενος καὶ οἱ ἐγκληθέντες εἰσι, καὶ ὁ ἀντιμαρτυρῶν αὐτῶν, ἑταίρους τὰ πρὸς αὐτῶν συμπροκαλεσάμενος. Theod. 2. 16.

Pope Liberius for such reason did request Constantius, that Athanasius his cause should be tryed at Alexandria; where — he (saith he) that is accused, and the accusers are, and the defender of them, and so we may upon examination had agree in our sentence about them.

Therefore divers ancient Canons of Synods did prohibit, that any

Inoleve-  
runt au-  
tem batte-  
nus into-

Causes should be removed out of the bounds of Provinces, or Dioceses; as elsewhere we shew.

terribilium vexationum abusus permulti, dum nimium frequenter à remotissimis etiam partibus ad Romanam curiam, & interdum pro parvis & minutis rebus ac negotiis quamplurimi citari ac evocari consueverunt, &c. Vid. Conc. Bal. Sess. 31. (p. 86.)

But hitherto very many intolerable vexatious abuses have prevailed, while too often men have been used to be cited and call'd out even from the remotest parts to the Court of Rome, and sometimes for slight and trivial businesses and occasions.

Vid. Hist.  
Conc.  
Teid. p. 61.

2. Such an Authority, as this pretence claimeth, must necessarily (if not withheld by continual Miracle) throw the Church into sad bondage. All the World must become slaves to one City, its wealth

Privilegia  
istius sedis  
perpetua  
sunt, divi-  
nitatis ra-  
dicata, at-  
que plan-

must be derived thither, its quiet must depend on it. For it (not being restrained within any bounds of place or time, having no check upon it of equal or co-ordinate power, standing upon Divine Institution, and therefore immutably settled) must of its own nature become absolute, and unlimited.

tata, impingi possunt, transferri non possunt; erabi possunt, evelli non possunt. P. Nic. I. ad Mich. Imp.

The privileges of this See are perpetual, rooted and founded upon Divine Authority, they may be dist. g. inst, they cannot be removed, they may be drawn aside, they cannot be pluck'd up.



Let it be however of right limited by Divine Laws, or Humane Canons, yet will it be continually encroaching, and stretching its power, until it grows enormous, and boundless. It will not endure to be pinched by any restraint. It will draw to it self the collation of all preferments, &c.

*Vid. Conc. Bas. Sess. 31. p. 87.*

It will assume all things to it self; trampling down all opposite claims of right and liberty; so that neither Pastor nor People shall enjoy or do any thing otherwise than in dependence on it, and at its pleasure.

It will be always forging new prerogatives, and interpreting all things in favour of them, and enacting sanctions to establish them; which none must presume to contest.

*Licet Apostolica prerogativa possimus de*

*qualibet Ecclesia clericum ordinare. P. Steph. apud Grat. caus. 9. qu. 3. cap. 20.* Though by our Apostolical prerogative we may ordain a Clergy-man of any Church.

It will draw to it self the disposal of all places; the exaction of goods. All Princes must become his Ministers, and executors of his Decrees.

*Hist. Conc. Trid. p. 60. so they pretend. Conc. Later. 4. (sub Innoc. 3.)*

It will mount above all Law, and Rule; not only challenging to be uncontrollable, and unaccountable, but not enduring any reproof of its proceedings, or contradiction of its dictates: a blind Faith must be yielded to all its Assertions as infallibly true, and a blind obedience to all its Decrees, as unquestionably holy: whosoever shall any-wise cross it in word or deed, shall certainly be discountenanced, condemned; ejected from the Church; so that the most absolute tyranny, that can be imagined, will ensue: All the World hath groaned and heavily complained of their exactions, particularly our poor Nation; it would raise indignation in any man to read the complaints\*.

*Sicq; alienus a divinis & Pontificalibus officiis, qui noluit*

*praeceptis Apostolicis obtemperare. Greg. IV. (dist. 19. c. 5.)* And let him have nothing at all to do with Divine and Pontifical Offices, who would not obey Apostolical Precepts \* *Vid. Mat. Paris.*

*Oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, & Temporalem Auctoritatem Spirituali subiaci potestati. Bonif. VIII. Extrav. Com. 1. 8. 1.*

But there must be a sword under a sword, and Temporal Authority subject to Spiritual.

This is consequent on such a pretence according to the very nature of things; and so in experience it hath happened. For,

*— ehesia  
piu officio  
di Ponca-*

*fici aggiungere con l'armi, & col fergue de Christiani, &c. Guicc. l. 11. p. 858.*

It is evident, that the Papacy hath devoured all the privileges and rights of all Orders in the Church, either granted by God, or established in the ancient Canons.

*Quid hodie erant Episcopi,*

*nisi umbra quadam? quid plus eis restabat quam baculus & mitra, &c. An. Sylv. de gestis Syn. Bas. lib. 1.*

What were Bishops now, but a kind of shadows? what had they left more than a Staff and a Mitre? &c.

The *Royalties* of Peter are become immense; and consistently to his practice the Pope doth allow men to tell him to his face, that all Power in Heaven and in Earth is given unto him.

*Conc. Lat. 5. Sess. 11. p. 129. De omni Ecclesia*

It belongeth to him to judge of the whole Church.

*jus habet judicandi. P. Gelas. Grat. Caus. 9. q. 3. cap. 18.*

He hath a plenitude (as he calleth it) of Power, by which he can infringe any Law, or do any thing that he pleaseth.

*Secundum plenitudinem po-*

*testatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare. Greg. decret. lib. 3. tit. 8. cap. 4.*

It is the tenor of his Bulls; that whoever rashly dareth to thwart his will, shall incur the indignation of Almighty God; and (as if that were not enough) of St. Peter, and St. Paul also.

*Hujus cul-* No man must presume to tax his faults; or to judge of his judgment.  
*pas isthic*

*redarguere presumit mortalium nullus. Grat. dist. 40. cap. 6. (Si Papa—) Neque cuiquam licere de ejus judicare*  
*judicio. Caus. 9. qu. 3. cap. 10.*

*Cum enim* It is Idolatry to disobey his commands, against their own Sovereign  
*obedire* Lord.

*Apostolice*  
*sedis superbi contemnunt. scelus idololatrie, teste Samuele, incurrunt. Greg. VII. Ep. 4. 2. Nulli fas est vel velle,*  
*vel posse transgredi Apostolice sedis precepta. Greg. IV. apud Grat. dist. 19. cap. 5.*

No man may nor can transgress the commands of the Apostolick See.

*Ab omnibus quicquid statuit, quicquid ordinat, perpetuo & irrefragabiliter observandum est. Ibid,*  
*cap. 4. (P. Steph.)*

— Whatever he decrees, whatever he ordains, must always and inviolably be observed by all.

*Erronea,* There are who dare in plain terms call him Omnipotent, and who  
*& heresi* ascribe infinite power to him. And that he is infallible, is the most  
*proxima* common and plausible opinion; so that at Rome the contrary is erro-  
*Bell de* neous, and within an inch of being heretical.  
*P. 4. 2.*

*Si autem Papa erraret precipiendo vi-*  
*tia, vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Ec-*  
*clesia credere vitia esse bona, & virtutes*  
*malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam pec-*  
*care. Bell. de Pont. 4. 5.*

We are now told, that If the Pope should  
err by enjoining vices, or forbidding virtues, the  
Church should be bound to believe vices to be good,  
and virtues evil, unless it would sin against Con-  
science.

The greatest Princes must stoop to his will; otherwise he hath power  
to cashier, and depose them.

*Gal. 5. 1.* Now what greater inconvenience, what more horrible iniquity, can  
*13.* there be, than that all God's people (that free people, who are called to  
*1 Pet. 2. 16.* freedom) should be subject to so intolerable a yoke, and miserable a  
slavery?

*Papa oc-* That tyranny soon had crept into the Roman Church Socrates tel-  
*cupavit* leth us.  
*omnia ju-*

*ra inferiorum Ecclesiarum, ita quod inferiores Prælati sunt pro nibilo. Card. Zab. de Sch. Innoc. VII. p. 360.*  
The Pope hath invaded all the rights of inferior Churches, so that all inferior Prelates are nothing set by.

*Ecclesia est mandra sive grex aut mul-*  
*titudo jumentorum sive asinorum. Eccl.*  
*c. 47.*

*Illi nos frenant, nos loræ alligant, nos sti-*  
*mulant, nobis jugum & onus imponunt. Ib.*

They have rendred true that definition of  
Scioppius. The Church is a stall, or herd, or multi-  
tude of Beasts, or Asses.

They bridle us, they harness us, they spur us, they  
lay Yokes and Laws upon us.

The greatest tyranny that ever was invented in the world is the pre-  
sence of Infallibility: for Dionysius and Phalaris did leave the mind free,  
(pretending only to dispose of body and goods according to their will;) but the Pope not content to make us do and say what he pleaseth, will have us also to think so; denouncing his imprecations and spiritual menaces if we do not.

3. Such an Authority will inevitably produce a depravation of Chri-  
stian Doctrine, by distorting it in accommodation of it to the promo-  
ting its designs and interests. It will blend Christianity with worldly  
notions and policies.

It certainly will introduce new Doctrines, and interpret the old ones  
so as may serve to the advancement of the power, reputation, pomp,  
wealth, and pleasure of those who manage it, and of their depen-  
dents.

That

That which is called *καπηλαδέν τ' λόγον τῷ Θεῷ* to make a trade of Religion, will be the great work of the Teachers of the Church. It will turn all Divines into mercenary, slavish, designing Flatterers. *It* <sup>2 Cor. 2. 17.</sup> <sup>1 Tim. 6. 5.</sup> <sup>Νομίζον-</sup>  
*των περιμενῶν τὸ ἔσπερον.* Supposing that gain is godliness. *Ἐν σκεπασεὶ πλεονεξία.* Theff. 2. 5. A cloke of Covetousness *Κύβητα.* Eph. 4. 4.

This we see come to pass, Christianity by the Papal influence being from its original simplicity transformed into quite another thing than it was; from a divine Philosophy designed to improve the reason, to moderate the passions, to correct the manners of men, to prepare men for conversation with God and Angels; modelled to a system of politick devices (of notions, of precepts, of rights,) serving to exalt and enrich the Pope, with his Court and Adherents, Clients and Vassals. *Pasce, id est regio more impera. Ecce*

*duos Gladios.*—*Oravi ne deficeret.*—Feed (i.e.) rule as a King. Behold two Swords.

What Doctrine of Christian Theology, as it is interpreted by their Schools, hath not a direct aspect, or doth not squint that way? especially according to the opinions passant and in vogue among them.

To pass over those concerning the Pope, (his Universal Pastorship, Judgship in controversies, Power to call Councils, Presidency in them, Superiority over them; Right to confirm, or annul them; his Infalibility; his double Sword, and Dominion (direct or indirect) over Princes; his dispensing in Laws, in Oaths, in Vows, in Matrimonial cases, with all other the monstrous prerogatives, which the sound Doctors of *Rome*, with encouragement of that Chair, do teach.)

What doth the Doctrine concerning the exempting of the Clergy from secular jurisdiction, and immunity of their goods from taxes signify, but their entire dependence on the Pope, and their being closely tyed to his interests?

What is the exemption of Monastical places from the jurisdiction of Bishops, but lifting so many Soldiers and Advocates to defend and advance the Papal Empire?

What meaneth the Doctrine concerning that middle Region of Souls, or Cloister of Purgatory, whereof the Pope holdeth the Keys; opening and shutting it at his pleasure, by dispensation of pardons and indulgences; but that he must be Master of the Peoples condition, and of their purse?

What meaneth the treasure of Merits, and supererogatory works, whereof he is the Steward, but a way of driving a trade, and drawing money from simple People, to his treasury?

Whither doth the entangling of Folks in perpetual Vows tend, but to assure them in a slavish dependence on their interests, eternally, without evasion or remedy; except by favourable dispensation from the Pope?

Why is the *opus operatum* in Sacraments taught to confer grace, but to breed a high opinion of the Priest, and all he doth?

Whence did the monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation (urged with so furious zeal) issue, but from design to magnify the credit of those, who by saying of a few words can make Our God and Saviour? and withal to exercise a notable instance of their power over men, in making them to renounce their Reason, and Senses?

Whither



Whither doth tend the Doctrine concerning the Mass being a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Dead, but to engage men to leave in their Wills good sums to offer in their behalf?

Why is the Cup withholden from the Laity, but to lay it low by so notable a distinction, in the principal mystery of our Religion, from the Priesthood?

Why is saying private Mass (or celebrating the Communion in solitude) allowed, but because Priests are pay'd for it, and live by it?

At what doth the Doctrine concerning the necessity of auricular Confession aim, but that thereby the Priests may have a mighty awe on the Consciences of all People, may dive into their Secrets, may manage their Lives as they please?

And what doth a like necessary particular Absolution intend, but to set the Priest in a lofty state of Authority above the People, as a Judge of his Condition, and Dispenser\* of his Salvation?

Why do they equal Ecclesiastical Traditions with Scripture, but that on the pretence of them they may obtrude whatever Doctrines, advantageous to their designs?

What drift hath the Doctrine concerning the Infallibility of Churches or Councils, but that when opportunity doth invite, he may call a company of Bishops together to establish what he liketh, which ever after must pass for certain truth, to be contradicted by none; so enslaving the minds of all men to his dictates, which always sute to his interest.

What doth the prohibition of Holy Scripture drive at, but a monopoly of knowledge to themselves, or a detaining of People in ignorance of truth and duty; so that they must be forced to rely on them for direction, must believe all they say, and blindly submit to their dictates; being disabled to detect their errors, or contest their opinions.

Why must the Sacraments be celebrated, and publick devotions exercised in an unknown Tongue, but that the Priests may seem to have a peculiar interest in them, and ability for them?

Why must the Priesthood be so indispensably forbidden Marriage, but that it may be wholly untacked from the State, and rest addicted to him, and governable by him; that the Persons and Wealth of Priests may be purely at his devotion?

To what end is the clogging Religion by multiplication of Ceremonies and Formalities, but to amuse the People, and maintain in them a blind reverence toward the \*Interpreters of the dark mysteries couch'd in them; and by seeming to encourage an exterior shew of Piety (or form of godliness) to gain reputation and advantage, whereby they might oppress the interior virtue and reality of it, as the Scribes and Pharisees did, although with less designs.

\*Vid Sleid.  
p. 673.

Why is the veneration of Images and Reliques, the credence of Miracles and Legends, the undertaking of Pilgrimages, and voyages to Rome, and other places, more holy than ordinary; sprinklings of Holy-water, consecrations of baubles, (with innumerable foppish knacks and trinkets) so cherished; but to keep the People in a slavish credulity and dotage; apt to be led by them whither they please, by any sleeveless pretence; and in the mean while to pick various gains from them by such trade?

What do all such things mean, but obscuring the native simplicity of Christianity, whereas it being represented intelligible to all men, would

would derogate from that high admiration, which these men pretend to from their peculiar and profound wisdom? And what would men spend for these toys, if they understood they might be good Christians, and get to Heaven without them?

What doth all that pomp of Religion serve for, but for ostentation of the dignity of those who administer it? It may be pretended for the honour of Religion, but it really conduceth to the glory of the Priesthood; who shine in those Pageantries.

Why is Monkery (although so very different from that which was in the ancient times) so cryed up as a superlative state of perfection; but that it filleth all places with swarms of lusty People, who are vowed Servants to him, and have little else to do but to advance that Authority, by which they subsist in that dronish way of life?

In fine, perusing the Controversies of *Bellarmino*, or any other Champion of *Romanism*, do but consider the nature and scope of each Doctrine, maintained by them; and you may easily discern, that scarce any of them but doth tend to advance the interest of the Pope, or of his sworn Vassals.

Whereas indeed our Lord had never any such design, to set up a sort of men in such distance above their brethren; to perk over them, and suck them of their goods by tricks; it only did charge People to allow their Pastors a competent maintenance for a sober life, with a moderate respect, as was needful for the common benefit of God's People; whom they were, with humility and meekness, to instruct and guide in the plain and simple way of Piety.

This is a grievous inconvenience; there being nothing wherein the Church is more concerned than in the preservation of its Doctrine pure and incorrupt from the leaven of hurtful errors, influential on practice.

4. The errors in Doctrine, and miscarriages in practice, which this Authority in favour to it self would introduce, would be established immovably, to the irrecoverable oppression of Truth and Piety; any reformation becoming impossible, while it standeth, or so far as it shall be able to oppose and obstruct it.

While particular Churches do retain their liberty, and Pastors their original co-ordination in any measure, if any Church or Bishop shall offer to broach any novel Doctrine or Practice of bad import, the others may endeavour to stop the settlement or progress of them; each Church at least may keep it self sound from contagion.

But when all Churches and Bishops are reduced into subjection to one Head, supported by the guards of his Authority, who will dare to contest, or be able to withstand, what he shall say or do? It will then be deemed high presumption, contumacy, rebellion, to dissent from his determinations, how false soever, or tax the practices countenanced by him however irregular and culpable.

\*He will assume to himself the privilege not to be crossed in any thing; and soon will claim *infallibility, the mother of incorrigibility*.

No error can be so palpable, which that Authority will not protect and shroud from confutation; no practice so enormous, which it will not palliate, and guard from reproof.

There will be Legions of mercenary Tongues to speak, and stipendiary Pens to write in defence of its Doctrines and Practices; so that whoever will undertake to oppose it shall be voted down and overwhelmed with noise; and shall incur all the discouragement and persecution

secution imaginable. So poor Truth will become utterly defenceless, wretched Vertue destitute of succour or patronage.

This is so in speculation, and we see it confirmed by experience; for when from the influence of this Power (as P. *Adrian* VI. did ingenuously confess) an apparent degeneracy in Doctrine, in Discipline, in Practice had seized on Christendom, all the

world feeling it, and crying out loudly for reformation, yet how stiff a repugnance did the adherents to this interest make thereto? with what industry and craft did Popes endeavour to decline all means of remedy?

*Centum  
gravami-  
na.*

What will not this Party do rather than acknowledge themselves mistaken or liable to error? what palliations, what shifts do not they use? what evidence of light do they not outface?

5. The same will induce a general corruption of manners.

For the chief Clergy partaking of its growth, and protected by its interest, (reciprocally supporting it, and being sheltered by it from any curb or control) will swell into great pride and haughtiness; will be tempted to scrape and hoard up wealth, by rapine, extortion, simony; will come to enjoy ease and sloth; will be immersed in sensuality and luxury, and will consequently neglect their charge.

*Vid. ipsum  
Greg. VII.  
Ep. 1422.  
45.  
See the de-  
scription  
of them  
in S. Ber-  
nard. in Cant. Sermon. Guicciard. in Suppl.*

The inferiors will become enamoured and ambitious of dignity, and will use all means and arts to attain it.

Thence emulation, discord, sycophantry will spring.

Thence all Ecclesiastical Offices will become venal; to be purchased by bribes, flattery, favour. —

The higher ranks will become fastuous, supercilious and domineering. The lower will basely crouch, cogg —

What then must the People be, the Guides being such?

*Adv. Pe-  
lag. in Riv.  
Castig. N.  
cap. 8.  
Vid. Ber-  
convers.  
St. Paul.  
Serm. 1.  
p. 87.*

Were such Guides like to edify the People by their Doctrine? Were they not like to damnify them by their Example?

That thus it hath happened Experience doth shew; and History doth abundantly testify. This was soon observed by a Pagan Historian, *Am. Marcellin.* By *St. Basil* ὁ φρενὸς δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

What mischief this, what scandal to Religion, what detriment to the Church, what ruins of Souls it produceth is visible.

The descriptions of *Rome*, and of that Church by *Mantuan*, do in a lively manner represent the great degeneracy and corruptions of it.

6. This Authority as it would induce corruption of manners, so it would perpetuate it; and render the state of things incorrigible.

For this *Head* of the Church, and the Supporters of his Authority will often need reformation, but never will endure it.

*— Nulla  
unquam  
monitione,  
nulla ex-  
hortatione induci jam longa tempore potuit, ut aliquam errorum emendationem Christo placentem, aut notissi-  
morum abusuum correctionem in Ecclesia Sancta Dei efficere satageret. Conc. Bas. Sess. 23. (p. 76.) Sess. 31.  
p. 89.*

That will happen of any Pope, which the Fathers of *Basil* complained of in *Pope Eugenius*.

He could never be brought in this long time by any advice or exhortation, seriously to set upon any amendment of errors or correction of the most gross abuses in the Holy Church of God.

*Vid. Conc.  
Trid. p. 22.*

If the Pope would (as *Pope Adrian* VI.) yet he will not be able to reform; the interests of his dependents crossing it.

If



If there hath happened a good Pope, who desired to reform; yet he hath been ridiculous when he endeavoured it; and found it impossible to reform even a few particulars in his own house, the incorrigible Roman Court.

The nature and pretended foundation of this spiritual Authority doth encourage it with insuperable obstinacy to withstand all reformation: for whereas if any temporal Power doth grow intolerable, God's Providence by Wars and Revolutions of State, may dispense a redress, they have prevented this; by supposing that in this case God hath tied his own hands; this Authority being immovably fixed in the same hands, from which no revolution can take it; whence from its exorbitances there can be no rescue or relief.

7. This Authority will spoil him in whom it is seated; corrupting his mind and manners; rendring him a Scandal to Religion, and a pernicious Instrument of wickedness by the influence of his example.

It will certainly render him a Tyrant, according to the definition of Aristotle, Pol. 4. 10. *Cui plus licet quàm par est, plus vult quàm licet.* Unde sicut languescere capite, reliquum postea corpus morbus invadat. Conc. Bas. Sess. 23. (p. 64.) Whence it comes to pass that if the Head be sick, the rest of the Body afterwards grows diseased. Vid. Conc. Bas. p. 87. Conc. Const. p. 1110.

To this an uncontrollable power (bridled with no restraint) and impunity doth naturally tend, and accordingly hath it been —

Vid. dist. 40. cap. 6. (hujus culpas, etsi.) Vid. Alv. Pelag. 4.

How many notorious Reprobates, Monsters of wickedness, have been in that See?

*jud. Riv. Cath. Orb. p. 141. Baron. Pope Marcellus II. doubted whether a Pope could be saved. Thuan. lib. 15. (p. 566) From John VIII to Leo XI. what a rabble of Rake-hells and Sots did sit in that Chair! Machiavel. Hist. lib. 16. p. 1271. Baron. Ann. 912. §. 8.*

If we survey the Lives of Popes, written by Historians most indifferent, or (as most have been) partial in favour to them, we shall find, at first good ones, Martyrs, Confessors, Saints — but after this exorbitant power had grown, how few good ones? how many extremely bad? The first Popes before *Constantine* were Holy men? the next were tolerable, while the Papacy kept within bounds of modesty; but when they having shaken off their Master, and renounced allegiance to the Emperor, (i. e. after *Gregory II.*) few tolerable; generally they were either Rake-hells, or intolerably arrogant, insolent, turbulent and ravenous.

*Bellarmino* and *Baronius* do bobb off this, by telling us that hence the providence of God is most apparent.

Baron. An. 897. §. 5. It was said of *Vespasian*, solus

*imperantium melior* — so apt is power to corrupt men. *Solus omnium ante se Principum in melius mutatus est.* Tac. Hist. 1. (p. 451.)

But do they call this preserving the Church; the permission of it to continue so long in such a condition, under the prevalence of such mischiefs? when hath God deserted any People if not then? when such Impiety more than Pagan doth reign in it.

How vain is that which P. Greg. VII.

citeth out of P. *Symmachus*, B. *Petrus perennem meritorum dotem cum hereditate innocentie misit ad posteros.* Greg. VII. Ep. 8. 21.

But what in the mean time became of those Souls, which by this means were ruined; what amends for the vast damage which Religion sustained?

T

*Quod Romanus Pontifex, si canonicè fuerit ordinatus, meritis B. Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus; was one of P. Greg. VII. his dictates. Peter.*

sustained? for the introducing so pernicious Customs hardly to be extirpated?

To what a pass of shameless wickedness must things have come, when such men as *Alexander VI.* having visibly such an impure brood, should be placed in this Chair?

Even after the Reformation began to curb their impudence, and render them more wary, yet had they the face to set *Paul the Third* there.

How unfit must such men be, to be the Guides of all Christendom; to breathe Oracles of Truth, to enact Laws of Sanctity?

*Sap. 1. 5.* How improper were those Vessels of Satan to be Organs of that Holy Spirit of discipline, which will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide where unrighteousness cometh in.

It will engage the Popes to make the Ecclesiastical Authority an Engine of advancing the Temporal concerns of his own Relations, (his Sons, his Nephews.)

*Vid. Guicciard. Machiav. Hist. Fl. p. 19.* What indeed is the Popedom now, but a Ladder for a Family to mount unto a great Estate? *Conc. Bas. (p. 65.)*

*— Cum non ob religionem,*

*Et Dei cultum appetere Pontificatum nostri Sacerdotes videantur, sed ut fratrum vel nepotum, vel familiarium ingluviem & avaritiam expleant. Plat. in Joh. XVI. (p. 298.)*

Whereas our Priests seem to desire the Popedom, not for Religion and the worship of God, but that they may fill the ravening appetite and covetousness of their brethren, or nephews, or familiars.

What is it, but introducing an old man into a place, by advantage whereof, a Family must make Hay while the Sun shines?

*1 Tim. 2. 1, 2.* This Pretence, upon divers obvious accounts, is apt to create great mischief in the world, to the disturbance of Civil Societies, and destruction or debilitation of temporal Authority, which is certainly God's Ordinance, and necessary to the well-being of mankind; so that supposing it, we may in vain pray for Kings, and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.

*Matt. 6. 24.* For suppose the two powers (Spiritual and Temporal) to be co-ordinate, and independent each of other; then must all Christians be put into that perplexed state of repugnant and incompatible obligations; concerning which our Lord saith; *No man can serve two Masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other.*

They will often draw several ways, and clash in their designs, in their laws, in their decisions; one willing and commanding that, which the other disliketh and prohibiteth.

*Bell. 5. 6. (p. 1415.)*

It will be impossible by any certain bounds to distinguish their Jurisdiction, so as to prevent contest between them; all temporal matters being in some respect spiritual (as being referrible to spiritual ends, and in some manner allied to Religion) and all spiritual things becoming temporal, as they conduce to the secular peace and prosperity of States; there is nothing, which each of these Powers will not hook within the verge of its cognizance and jurisdiction; each will claim a right to meddle in all things; one pretending thereby to further

ther the good of the Church, the other to secure the interest of the State: and what end or remedy can there be of the differences hence arising; there being no third Power to arbitrate or moderate between them?

Each will prosecute its cause by its advantages; the one by instruments of temporal power, the other by spiritual arms of censures and curses.

And in what a case must the poor People then be? how distracted in their consciences, how divided in their affections, how discordant in their practices? according as each pretence hath influence upon them, by its different arguments or peculiar advantages?

How can any man satisfy himself in performing or refusing obedience to either? How many (by the intricacy of the point, and contrary pulling) will be withdrawn from yielding due compliance on the one hand or the other?

What shall a man do, while one in case of disobedience to his Commands doth brandish a Sword, the other thundreth out a Curse against him; one threatneth death, the other excision from the Church; both denounce damnation?

What animosities and contentions, what discomposures and confusions must this Constitution of things breed in every place? and how can a Kingdom so divided in it self stand, or not come into desolation. Matt. 12.  
25.

Such an advantage infallibly will make Popes affect to invade the temporal Power.

It was the reason, which Pope *Paschal* alledged against *Henry IV.* because he did *Ecclesiæ regnum auferre.* P. Pasch. II.  
Ep. 7.

It is indeed impossible, that a co-ordination of these Powers should subsist; for each will be continually encroaching on the other; each for its own defence and support will continually be struggling and clambing to get above the other: there will never be any quiet till one come to subside and truckle under the other; Whereby the Sovereignty of the one or the other will be destroyed. Each of them soon will come to claim a Supremacy in all causes, and the power of both Swords; and one side will carry it.

It is indeed necessary, that men for a time continuing possessed with a reverence to the Ecclesiastical Authority, as independent and uncontrollable, it should at last overthrow the temporal: by reason of its great advantages above it; for,

The Spiritual Power doth pretend an Establishment purely Divine; which cannot by any accidents undergo any change, diminutions or translation, to which Temporal dominions are subject: Its power therefore, being perpetual, irreverfible, depending immediately of God, can hardly be checked, can never be conquered. Vid. Mach.  
Hist. Flor.  
p. 18. —  
Impeti  
possunt hu-

*manis presumptionibus quæ divino sunt iudicio constituta, vinci autem quorumlibet potestate non possunt.*  
P. Gel. Ep. 8. Felix P. Ep. 1. (p. 597.)

It fighteth with Tongues and Pens, which are the most perillous Weapons.

It can never be disarmed, fighting with Weapons that cannot be taken away, or deprived of their edge and vigour.

It worketh by most powerful considerations upon the Consciences and Affections of men upon pain of damnation, promising heaven, and threatning hell; which upon some men have an infinite sway, upon all



men a considerable influence; and thereby will be too hard for those who only can grant Temporal Rewards, or inflict Temporal Punishments. It is surely a notable advantage that the Pope hath above all Princes, that he commandeth not only as a Prince, but as a Guide; so that whereas we are not otherwise bound to obey the commands of Princes, than as they appear concordant with God's Law, we must observe his commands absolutely, as being therefore lawful, because he commandeth them, that involving his assertion of their lawfulness, to which (without farther inquiry or scruple) we must submit our understanding, his words sufficiently authorizing his commands for just. We are not only obliged to obey his commands but to embrace his doctrines.

It hath continual opportunities of conversing with men; and thereby can insinuate and suggest the obligation to obey it, with greatest advantage, in secrecy, in the tenderest seasons.

It claimeth a power to have its instruction admitted with assent; and will it not instruct them for its own advantage? All its Assertions must be believed---- is not this an infinite advantage?

By such advantages the Spiritual Power (if admitted for such as it pretendeth) will swallow and devour the Temporal; which will be an extreme mischief to the world.

*Non enim volumus aut propter principum potentiam Ecclesiasticam minus dignitatem, aut pro Ecclesiastica dignitate Principum potentiam mutuari, P. Pasch. II. Ep. 28, & 29.* The very pretence doth immediately crop and curtail the natural Right of Princes; by exempting great numbers of Persons (the participants and dependents of this Hierarchy) from subjection to them. By withdrawing Causes from their Jurisdiction. By commanding in their Territories, and drawing People out of them to their Judicatories. By having influence on their Opinions. By draining them of Wealth, &c.

*For we will not that either the Ecclesiastical dignity should be diminished, by reason of the Prince's power, or that the Prince's power should be curtail'd for the Ecclesiastical dignity.*

In vain did St. Bernard, (*de Consid. 1*) To this discourse Experience abundantly doth yield its Attestation; for, How often have the \*Popes thwarted Princes in the exercise of their Power; challenging their Laws and Administrations as prejudicial to Religion? as contrary to Ecclesiastical Liberty?

*quid fines alienos invaditis? quid falcem vestram in alienam messem extenditis?* Why do you invade other men's territories? why thrust you your sickle into other Men's harvest? \* *Aristes furiosos.* Bell. 5. 7.

*Bodin (l. 9.)* observeth, that if any Prince were a Heretick, (that is, if the Pope could pick occasion to call him so) or a Tyrant (that is, in his opinion) or any-wise scandalous, the Pope would excommunicate him; and would not receive him to favour, but upon his acknowledging himself a feudatory to the Pope: So he drew in most Kingdoms to depend on him.

How often have they excommunicated them, and interdicted their People from entertaining communion with them?

*Vid. Plat. de Bonif. VIII. p. 467.* How many Commotions, Conspiracies, Rebellions and Insurrections against Princes have they raised in several Countries?

*Jul. 2. Non sine suspitione, quod illorum* How have they inveigled People from their Allegiance? How many Massacres and Assassinations have they caused? How have they depressed and vilified the Temporal Power.

*temporum Pontifices, qui bella extinguere, discordias tollere debuissent, suscitarent ea fortius atque navigarent.* Episc. Modrus. in Conc. Lat. V. Sess. 6. (p. 72.)

Not without suspicion, that the Popes of those times, who ought to have extinguished wars, and put an end to dissensions, did rather raise them up, and cherish them.

See *Greg. VII. Ep. 4. 2 8. 21.*

Have they not assumed to themselves Superiority over all Princes? The Emperor himself (the chief of Christian Princes) they did call their Vassal, exacting an Oath from them, whereof you have a Form in the Canon Law, and a declaration of Pope *Clement V.* that it is an Oath of Fealty. *Vid. Conc. Lugd. p. 851.*

Have they not challenged propriety in both Swords, *Ectē duo Gladii?*

How many Princes have they pretended to depose, and dispossess of their Authority? *Auctoritate Apostolica de fra-*

*erum nostrorum consilio declaramus illa juramenta praeiusta fidelitatis existere & censeri debere. Clement. lib. 2. Tit. 9. cap. unicum.*

We declare out of our Apostolical authority, by the advice of our Brethren, that the foresaid oaths of fealty ought to be, and be so esteemed.

Consider the Pragmatical Sanctions, Provisors, Compositions, Concordats, &c. which Princes have been forced to make against them, or with them to secure their Interest.

Many good Princes have been forced to oppose them, as *Henry the Second of England*, *King Lewis the Twelfth of France*, (that Just Prince, *Pater Patriae*) *Perdam Babylonis nomen.* *Thuan. lib. 1.*

How often have they used this as a pretence of raising and fomenting Wars? confiding in their Spiritual Arms; interdicting Princes, that would not comply with their designs, for advancing the interests not only of their See, but of their private Families? *Abutente Christianorum Pastore Christianorum Principum*

*pum viribus, ut privata ambitioni, & suorum libidini inserviret. Thuan. lib. 1. p. 42.* The Pastor of Christians abusing the Power of Christian Princes that he might gratify his private ambition, and the will and lust of his Friends.

*Bodin* observeth that Pope *Nicholas I.* was the first who excommunicated Princes. *Platina* doth mention some before him: But it is remarkable, that although Pope *Leo I.* (a high spirited Pope (*Fortissimus Leo*) as *Liberatus* calleth him) was highly provoked against *Theodosius Junior*; Pope *Gelasius*, and divers of his Predecessors and Followers — Pope *Gregory II.* against *Leo* — *Vigilius* against *Justinian*, &c. yet none of them did presume to excommunicate the Emperors. *Observ.*

All these dealings are the natural result of this Pretence; and, supposing it well-grounded, are capable of a plausible justification: for is it not fit, (seeing one must yield) that Temporal should yield to Spiritual?

Indeed, granting the Papal Supremacy in Spirituals, I conceive the high flying Zelots of the *Roman Church*, who subject all Temporal Powers to them, have great reason on their side, for co-ordinate Power cannot subsist, and it would be only an eternal Seminary of perpetual discords.

The quarrel cannot otherwise be well composed than by wholly disclaiming the fictitious and usurped power of the Pope: for,

Two such Powers (so inconsistent and cross to each other, so apt to interfere, and consequently to breed everlasting mischiefs to mankind between them) could not be instituted by God. —

He would not appoint two different Vicegerents in his Kingdom at the same time. —

But

Tort. T. But it is plain, that he hath instituted the civil Power; and endowed  
p. 210. it with a Sword. That Princes are his Lieutenants \*.  
\* P. Anast. calleth the Emperor Anast. Vicarium. Epist. (p. 670.)

That in the ancient times the Popes did not claim such Authority, but avowed themselves Subjects to Princes.

Eccl. Leod. 9. Consequently this Pretence is apt to engage Christian Princes a-  
p. 522. gainst Christianity; for they will not endure to be crossed, to be depressed, to be trampled on.

This Popes often have complained of; not considering it was their own insolence that caused it.

Secundum 18. Whereas now Christendom is split into many parcels, subject to  
mutatio- divers civil Sovereignities, it is expedient that correspondently there  
nes tem- should be distinct Ecclesiastical Governments, independant of each o-  
porum ther, which may comply with the respective civil Authorities in promo-  
transfe- ting the good and peace both of Church and State.  
runtur e-  
tiam reg-  
na terra-  
rum; unde etiam Ecclesiasticarum parochiarum fines in plerisque provinciis mutari expedit & transferri. P.  
Palsch. II. Ep. 19.

It is fit, that every Prince, should in all things govern all his Subjects; and none should be exempted from subordination to his Authority: As Philosophers, and Physicians of the Body; so Priests, and Physicians of the Soul; not in exercising their Function, but in taking care that they do exercise it duly for the honour of God, and in consistence with publick good: otherwise many grievous inconveniences must ensue.

It is of perillous consequence, that foreigners should have authoritative influence upon the Subjects of any Prince; or have power to intermeddle in affairs.

Princes have a natural Right to determine with whom their Subjects shall have intercourse; which is inconsistent with a right of Foreigners to govern or judge them in any case, without their leave.

Every Prince is obliged to imploy the Power entrusted to him, to the furtherance of God's Service, and encouragement of all good Works; as a Supreme power, without being liable to obstruction from any other power.

It would irritate his power, if another should be beyond his coercion.

Vid. Bod. It is observable, that the Pope by intermeddling in the affairs of King-  
de Rep. 1. doms did so wind himself into them, as to get a pretence to be Master  
9 (p. 195.) of each; Princes being his Vassals and Feudatories.  
Car les

Princes  
Christien avoient presque tous opinion, que le Pape estoit absolument seigneur souverain de tous les Royaumes  
dela Chrestiente. Bod. ib. p. 196. Tort. Tort. p. 216. Sc. — Greg. VII. Ep. 1. 7. 2. 13. Alex. II. Ep. 8.

Ἡ τοσαύτη διαφωνία καὶ μάχη τῇ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ γίνεσθαι, ἕκαστος τῶν τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν 1. χ. διδασκαλίας ἀριστοτέρως, λογισμῶν δὲ τινῶν καὶ ὅπως ἰσχυρὸν ἀνδραγαθίαν καὶ αὐθιγίαν, καὶ μάλλον ἀρχὴν ἀπ' ἐκείνης τοῦ κυρίου, ἢ ἀρχαίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου βυλομένην. Bat de Jud. Dei, T. 2. p. 259.

So great a dissension and jarring there is among men in the Church, while every one swerves from the Doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, and asserts certain conceits and rules of his own by his own authority, and had rather rule contrary to the Lord, than be rul'd by the Lord.

11. Such an Authority is needless and useles; it not serving the ends which it pretendeth; and they being better compassed without it.

It pretendeth to maintain Truth; but indeed it is more apt to oppress it.

Truth is rather (as St. Cyprian wisely observeth) preserved by the multitude of Bishops, whereof some will be ready to relieve it, when assaulted by others.

Truth



Truth cannot be supported merely by humane Authority; especially that Authority is to be suspected, which pretendeth dominion over our minds. What Controversy, being doubtful in it self, will not after his Decision continue doubtful? his Sentence may be eluded by interpretation as well as other Testimonies or Authorities.

The opinion of a man's great wisdom or skill may be the ground of assent, in defect of other more cogent Arguments; but Authority of Name or Dignity is not proper to convince a man's understanding. Men obey, but not believe Princes more than others, if not more learned than others.

It pretendeth to maintain Order: but how? by introducing Slavery; by destroying all Rights; by multiplying Disorders; by hindring Order to be quietly administred in each Country.

It pretendeth to be the only means of Unity and Concord in Opinion, by determining Controversies: which its Advocates affirm necessary.

*Necessesse est, ut omnes fideles idem sentiant.*

*riant. Bell. 1. 9. It is necessary that all the Faithful should be of the same Opinion.*

But how can that be necessary which never was *de facto*? not even in the *Roman Church*?

Hath the Pope effected this? do all his Followers agree in all points? Do they agree about his Authority? Do not they differ and dispute about infinity of Questions? Are all the points frivolous, about which their Divines and Schoolmen dispute? Why did not the Council of *Trent* it self, without more ado, and keeping such a disputing, refer all to his Oracular Decision?

Necessary points may and will, by all honest people, be known and determined without him, by the clear Testimony of Scripture, by consent of Fathers, by general Tradition. — And other points need not to be determined.

*intransigentes in Deo. γρηγορ. Ath.*

That he may be capable of that Office, he must be believed appointed by God thereto; which is a question it self to be decided without him, to satisfaction. His power is apt no otherwise to knock down Controversies, than by depressing Truth; not suffering any Truth to be asserted, which doth not favour its Interests.

Concord was maintained and Controversies decided without them in the ancient Church; in Synods, wherein he was not the sole Judge, nor had observable influence.

The Fathers did not think such Authority needful, otherwise they would have made more use of it.

*Nemini prescribentes.*

A more ready way to define Controversies, is for every one not to prescribe to others, or to prosecute; for then men would more calmly see the Truth, and consent.

It pretendeth to maintain Peace and Unity. But nothing hath raised more fierce Dissensions, or so many bloody Wars in Christendom as it.

It is apt by tyrannical administration to become intolerable, and so to break the Ecclesiastical State; to raise Schisms and Troubles.

It is like to extinguish genuine Charity, which is free and uncompelled.

All the Peace and Charity which it endureth, is by force and compulsion, not out of choice and good affection.

V. The Ancients did assert to each Bishop a free, absolute, independent Authority, subject to none, directed by none, accountable to none

on

on Earth, in the administration of affairs properly concerning his particular Church.

This is most evident in St. Cyprian's Writings; out of which it will not be amiss to set down some passages, manifesting the sense and practice in the Church in his time, to the satisfaction of any ingenuous mind.

*Manente concordie vinculo, & perseverante Catholica Ecclesia indiviso Sacramento, actum suum disponit & dirigit unusquisque; Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus. Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Antiochianum.)*

*Ceterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbibierint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter Collegas, pacis & concordie vinculo quedam propria, que apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere; qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cum habeat in Ecclesie administratione voluntatis sue liberum arbitrium unusquisque prepositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus. Cypr. Ep. 72. (ad Stephanum.)*

*Hec ad conscientiam tuam, frater charissime, & pro honore communi & pro simplici dilectione perculimus, &c. Consensu & auctoritate communi.*

sent and authority, had established concerning the degradation of Clergy-men, who had been ordained by Hereticks, or had lapsed into Schism.

*Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, & equum sit pariter ac iustum, ut unusquisque causa illic audiat, ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis Pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque & gubernet, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus, oportet utique eos quibus presumus, non circumcursare, &c. Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad Cornelium.)*

some factious Clergy-men addressing themselves to him with factious suggestions, to gain his Countenance.

*Hac tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescripsimus, frater charissime; nemini prescribentes, aut prejudicantes, quo minus unusquisque; Episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. Cypr. Ep. 73. (ad Sababianum.)*

*Qua in parte nemini verecundia & modestia nostra prejudicat, quo minus unusquisque; quod putat sentiat, & quod senserit faciat. Cypr. Ep. 76. (ad Magnum.)*

*Nemini prescribentes, quo minus statuatur quod putat unusquisque Prepositus, actus sui rationem Domino redditurus; secundum quod Apostolus, &c. Ibid.*

*Supere est ut de hac re singuli quid sententiamus proferamus, neminem iudicantes, aut a jure communione aliquem si diversum senserit amoventes; neque enim quis*

*The Bond of concord abiding, and the Sacrament (or Doctrine) of the Catholick Church persisting undivided, every Bishop disposeth and directeth his own acts, being to render an account of his purpose to the Lord: this he writeth, when he was pleading the cause of Pope Cornelius against Novatian; but then, it seemeth, not dreaming of his Supremacy over others.*

*But we know that some will not lay down what once they have imbibed, nor will easily change their mind; but, the bond of peace and concord with their Collegues being preserved, will retain some peculiar things, which have once been used by them; in which matter neither do we force any, or give law; whenas every Prelate hath in the administration of his Church the free power of his will, being to render unto the Lord an account of his acting: this, saith he, writing to Pope Stephanus, and in a friendly manner, out of common respect and single love, (not out of servile obeisance) acquainting him what he and his brethren in a Synod, by common con-*

*For seeing it is ordained by us all, and it is likewise equal and just, that each man's cause should be there heard where the crime is committed; and to each Pastor a portion of the Flock is assigned, which each should rule and govern, being to render an account to his Lord; those indeed over whom we preside ought not to ramble about: this, saith he, in his Epistle to Pope Cornelius, upon occasion of*

*These things I have briefly written back according to our meanness, dear brother; prescribing to none, nor prejudging, that every Bishop should not do what he thinks good, having a free power of his will.*

*In which matter our bashfulness and modesty doth not prejudice any one; so that every one may not judge he thinketh, and act as he judgeth: Prescribing to none, so that every Bishop may not resolve what he thinks good, being to render an account to the Lord, &c.*

*It remaineth that each of us do utter his opinion about this matter, judging no man, nor removing any man, if he dissenteth, from the right of communion;*

nion; for neither doth any of us constitute himself Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terrour driveth his Collegues to a necessity of obeying; whenas every Bishop hath upon account of his liberty and authority his own free choice, and is no less exempted from being judged by another, than he is incapable to judge another; but let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, and who alone, hath power both to prefer us to the government of his Church, and to judge of our acting: these words did St. Cyprian speak as Proloquutor of the great Synod of Bishops at Carthage; and what words could be more exprefs, or more full, in assertion of the Episcopal Liberties and Rights, against almost every branch of Romish pretences?

He disavoweth the practice of one Bishop excluding another from communion for dissent in opinion about disputable points: He rejecteth the pretence that any man can have to be a Bishop of Bishops, or superior to all his Brethren: He condemneth the imposing opinions upon Bishops, and constraining them to obedience; He disclaimeth any power in one Bishop to judge another; He asserteth to each Bishop a full liberty and power to manage his own concerns according to his discretion; He affirmeth every Bishop to receive his power only from Christ, and to be liable only to his judgment.

We may observe, that St. Austin, in his Reflections upon the Prefaces in that Synod, doth approve, yea admire that Preface, passing high commendations on the smartest passages of it which assert common liberty, professing his own conformity in practice to them; *In this consultation* (saith he) *is shewed a pacifick soul, overflowing with plenty of charity; and, We have therefore a free choice of inquiry granted to us by the most mild and most veracious speech of Cyprian himself; and, Now if the proud and tumid minds of Hereticks dare to extol themselves against the holy humility of this speech—than which what can be more gentle, more humble?*

Would St. Austin have swallowed those Sayings, could he have so much applauded them, if he had known a just power then extant and radiant in the World, which they do impeach and subvert? No, I trow; he did not know, nor so much as dream of any such; although the Pope was under his nose while he was discussing that point, and he could hardly talk so much of St. Cyprian without thinking of Pope Stephen.

However let any man of sense honestly read and weigh those passages, considering who did write them, to whom he writ them, upon what occasions he writ them, when he writ them; that he was a great Primate of the Church, a most holy, most prudent, most humble and meek Person; that he addressed divers of them to Bishops of Rome; that many of them were touching the concerns of Popes, that he writ them in times of persecution and distress, which produce the most sober and serious thoughts; then let him if he can, conceive, that all Christian Bishops were then held subject to the Pope, or owned such a power due to him as he now claimeth.

We may add a contemporary Testimony of the Roman Clergy, addressing to St. Cyprian in these words; *Although a mind well conscious to it self, and supported by the*

*quam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem Collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis & potestatis suae arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare; sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem & proponendi nos in Ecclesiae suae gubernatione, & de actu nostro judicandi. Cyr. in pref. Conc. Carthag.*

*Habemus ergo querendi liberum arbitrium ipsius Cypriani nobis mitissimo & veracissimo sermone concessum. Lib. 3. cap. 3.*

*Nunc si se audent superba & tumida cervices hereticorum adversus sanctam humilitatem hujus sententiae extollant. Lib. 2. cap. 3.*

*Quid mansuetius, quid humiliter? Lib. 3. cap. 3.*

*Quamquam bene sibi conscius animus, & Evangelica disciplinae vigore subnixus, vigor*



Et verius sibi in decretis celestibus testis effectus, soleat solo Deo iudice esse contentus, nec alterius aut laudes petere, aut accusationes pertimescere; tamen geminata sunt laude condigni, qui cum conscientiam sciant Deo soli debere se iudici, actus tamen suos desiderant etiam ab ipsis suis fratribus comprobari: quod te, frater Cyprian, facere non mirum est, qui pro sua verecundia, & ingenua industria consiliorum tuorum nos non tam iudices voluisti, quam participes inveniri—Cler. Rom. ad Cyp. Ep. 31.

vigor of Evangelical discipline, and having in heavenly doctrines become a true witness to it self, is wont to be content with God for its only judge; and not to desire the praises, nor to dread the accusations of another; yet they are worthy of double praise, who when they know they owe their consciences to God only as judge, yet desire also their actions to be approved by their brethren themselves; the which it is no wonder that you, brother Cyprian, should do, who according to your modesty and natural industry would have us not so much judges as partakers of your

**Counsels**—— Then it seems the College of Cardinals, not so high in the instep as they are now, did take St. Cyprian to be free, and not accountable for his actions to any other Judge but God.

That this notion of liberty did continue a good time after in the

\*Εκαστος δ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ἔχει καὶ ταύτῃ παρρησίᾳ διοικεῖν καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καθάρεται, καὶ πνευματικῶν ποιῆσαι πράξεις καὶ λόγους καὶ τὰς ἐκείνου πόλιν; οἷς καὶ χειρουργεῖν ἀποκαταστήσει καὶ διακόνους, καὶ ἡγούμενους ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν.—Syn. Ant. Can. 9.

Church, we may see by that Canon of the Antiochene Synod; ordaining that every Bishop have power of his own Bishoprick, govern it according to the best of his care and discretion, and provide for all the Country belonging to his City, so as to ordain Priests and Deacons, and dispose things aright.

\*Ἡμεῖς δ' καὶ πάντα τὸ ἑκκλησιαστικόν, καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες καὶ τὸ θεῖον, καὶ ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ἔχουσιν. Syn. Chal. Act. 1. p. 114.

The Monks of Constantinople in the Synod of Chalcedon, said thus; We are Sons of the Church, and have one Father, after God, our Archbishop: they forgot their Sovereign Father the Pope.

Omnium nostrum mater communis sub Sponsus Iesu Christi dispositione. Gerv. Dorob. (p. 1663.) apud Twiss. p. 72.

The like notion may seem to have been then in England, when the Church of Canterbury was called the common Mother of all under the disposition of its Spouse Jesus Christ.

Vid. Ep. P. Celest. I. in Conc. Eph. Act. 2. (p. 324.)

VI. The Ancients did hold all Bishops, as to their Office, originally according to Divine Institution, or abstracting from humane Sanctions framed to preserve Order and Peace, to be equal; for that all are Successors of the Apostles, all derive their Commission and Power in the same tenor from God, all of them are Ambassadors, Stewards, Vicars of Christ; entrusted with the same divine Ministeries of instructing, dispensing the Sacraments, ruling and exercising Discipline; to which Functions and Privileges the least Bishop hath right, and to greater the biggess cannot pretend.

One Bishop might exceed another in Splendor, in Wealth, in Reputation, in extent of Jurisdiction, as one King may surpass another in amplitude of Territory; but as all Kings, so all Bishops, are equal in Office and essentials of Power, derived from God.

Baron. An. 57. § 30. Pl. 45. 16. Ubicumq; fuerit Episcopus, five Romæ five Eugubii, Sc. Hieron. ad Evagr. Ep. 85.

Hence they applied to them that in the Psalm, *Instead of thy Fathers shall be thy Children, whom thou maist make Princes in all the earth.*

This was St. Hierom's Doctrine in those famous words; *Wherever a Bishop be, whether at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Thanis, he is of the same worth, and of the same Priesthood; the force of wealth, and lowness of poverty doth not render a Bishop more high, or more low; for that all of them are Successors of the Apostles: to evade which plain assertion, they have forged distinctions, whereof St. Hierom surely did never think, he speaking simply concerning Bishops, as they stood by Divine Institution, not according to humane Models, which gave some advantages over other.*

That

That this notion did continue long in the Church, we may see by the Elogies of Bishops in later Synods; for instance, that in the Synod of Compeigne; *It is convenient all Christians should know what kind of Office the Bishop is— who 'tis plain are the Vicars of Christ, and keep the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

And that of the Synod of Melun; *And though all of us unworthy, yet are the Vicars of Christ, and Successors of his Apostles.*

In contemplation of which verity, St. Gregory Nazianzene observing the declension from it introduced in his times, by the ambition of some Prelates, did vent that famous exclamation: *O that there were not at all any presidency, or any preference in place, and tyrannical enjoyment of prerogatives— which earnest wish he surely did not mean to level against the Ordinance of God, but against that which lately began to be intruded by men: And what would the good man have wished, if he had been aware of those pretences about which we discourse; which then did only begin to bud and peep up in the World?*

1. Common practice is a good interpreter of common sentiments in any case; and it therefore sheweth, that in the primitive Church the Pope was not deemed to have a right of Universal Sovereignty; for if such a thing had been instituted by God, or established by the Apostles, the Pope certainly with evident clearness would have appeared to have possessed it; and would have sometimes (I might say frequently, yea continually) have exercised it in the first Ages; which that he did not at all, we shall make, I hope, very manifest by reflecting on the chief passages occurring then; whereof indeed there is scarce any one, which duly weighed, doth not serve to overthrow the Roman pretence; but that matter I reserve to another place; and shall propound other considerations, declaring the sense of the Fathers; only I shall add, that indeed,

2. The state of the most primitive Church did not well admit such an Universal Sovereignty. For that did consist of small bodies incoherently situated and scattered about in very distant places, and consequently unfit to be modelled into one political Society, or to be governed by one Head. Especially considering their condition under Persecution and Poverty. What convenient resort for Direction or Justice could a few distressed Christians in Egypt, Ethiopia, Parthia, India, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia, Cappadocia, and other parts, have to Rome? what trouble, what burthen had it been to seek Instruction, Succour, Decision of Cases thence? Had they been obliged or required to do so, what offences, what clamours would it have raised? seeing that afterward, when Christendom was connected, and compacted together; when the state of Christians was flourishing and prosperous, when passages were open, and the best of opportunities of correspondence were afforded, yet the setting out of these pretences did cause great oppositions and stirrings; seeing the exercise of this Authority, when it had obtained most vigor, did produce so many grievances, so many complaints, so many courtes to check and curb it, in Countries feeling the inconveniences and mischiefs springing from it?

*Omnibus in Christiana religione constitutis scire convenit quale sit ministerium Episcoporum— quos constat esse Vicarios Christi, & Clavigeros Regni Caelorum, &c. Syn. Compend. An. Dom. 833. (apud Bin. Tom 6. p. 361.)*

*Nos omnes licet indigni, Christi tamen Vicarii, & Apostolorum ipsius Successores. Syn. Meldens. An. Dom. 845. (apud Bin. Tom. 6. p. 402.)*

Ο ΠΙΛΗΤΟΣ ΤΙ ΜΗ ΠΡΟΙΤΙ

Ὅτι θελοντες μὴ εἶναι ὡς οἱ ἄλλοι, μὴδὲ περὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ, καὶ τυραννικῆς ἐξουσίας— Greg. Naz. Orat. 28.

The want of the like in the first Ages is a good Argument, that the cause of them had not yet sprung up; Christendom could not have been so still, if there had been then so meddlesom a body in it, as the Pope now is.

*Nobis, post excessum nobilissima memoria viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultatem constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur—* Ch. Rom. ad Cyp. Ep. 31.

more in that state of things would a Bishop there be fit to moderate things over all the World; when (as Rigaltius truly noteth) the Church

*Varia tunc Ecclesia vexationibus oppressa, difficilis & infrequens erat Provinciarum inter se communicatio. Rigalt. in Cyp. Ep. 67.*

*Verum enim est impeditam fuisse eo tempore non parum Pontificis auctoritatem— propter persecutiones continuas non potuisse Romanos Pontifices libere exercere eam, quàm à Christo acceperant auctoritatem, &c. Bell. de R. P. 2. 17.*

The Roman Clergy in their Epistle to St. Cyprian told him, that because of the difficulty of things and times, they could not constitute a Bishop who might moderate things immediately belonging to them in their own precincts: how much being then oppressed with various vexations, the communication of Provinces between themselves was difficult and unfrequent.

Wherefore Bellarmine himself doth confess, that in those times, before the Nicene Synod the authority of the Pope was not a little hindered, so that because of continual persecutions he could not freely exercise it.

The Church therefore could so long subsist without the use of such Authority, by the vigilance of Governors over their Flocks, and the friendly correspondence of neighbour Churches: And if he would let it alone it might do so still.

That could be no Divine Institution, which had no vigor in the first and best times: but an Innovation raised by Ambition.

VII. The Ancients, when occasion did require, did maintain their equality of Office and Authority particularly in respect to the Roman Bishops; not only interpretatively by practice, but directly and formally in express terms asserting it.

Thus when *Felicissimus* and his Complices, being rejected by St. Cyprian, did apply themselves to Pope *Cornelius* for his communion and countenance, St. Cyprian affirmed that to be an irregular and unjust

*Nisi si paucis desperatis & perditis minor esse videtur auctoritas Episcoporum in Africa constitutorum, qui jam de illis judicaverunt—*

course; subjoining, *Except to a few desperate and wicked Persons, the authority of the Bishops constituted in Africk, who have already judged of them, do seem less; that is, inferior to any other Au-*

thority, particularly to that of Rome, unto which they had recourse; what other meaning could he have? doth not his Argument require this meaning?

\* Fides quam exposuerunt qui affuerunt Episcopi 97 — Hilar. de Synod. (p. 367.)

Congregatam Sanctorum Synodum. Hilar. ibid.

Venerabiles Antiocheni Canones. P. Nicol. I. Ep. 9 (p. 519)

their Epistle to Pope *Julius*, complaining of his demeanour in the case of *Athanasius*, did flatly assert to themselves an equality with him;

*They did not (as Sozomen reciteth out of their Epistle) therefore think it equal, that they should be thought inferiors, because they had not so big and numerous a Church.*

Οὐ γὰρ τὸ τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας φέρειν ἡξίον, ὅτι μὴ μὴδὲ, ἢ πλεονάζει Ἐκκλησίας πλεονάζουσιν. Soz. 3. 8.

That Pope himself testifieth the same in his Epistle to them, extant in the second Apology of *Athanasius*; If, saith he, ye do truly

conceive



conceive the honour of Bishops to be equal, and the same; and ye do not, as ye write, judge of Bishops according to the magnitude of Cities; which assertion of theirs so flatly thwarting Papal Supremacy he doth not at all confute, yea not so much as contradict; and therefore reasonably may be interpreted to yield consent thereto; the rule, *He that holdeth his peace seemeth to consent*, never holding better than in this case, when his Copyhold was so nearly touched; indeed he had been very blameable to wave such an occasion of defending so important a Truth; or in letting so pestilent an Errour to pass without correction or reproof.

After the Pope had climbed higher than at that time (upon the ladders of dissension and disorders in the Church) yet he was reproved by Euphemius Bishop of Constantinople, for preferring himself before his Brethren; as we may collect from those words of a zealous Pope, *We desire not to be placed above others (as you say) so much as to have fellowship holy and well-pleasing to God with all the faithful.*

That Pope Gregory I. did not hold himself superior to other Bishops, many Sayings of his do infer; for in this he placeth the fault of the Bishop of Constantinople, which he so often and so severely reprehendeth, that he did prefer himself before, and extol himself above other Bishops.

*se ceteris præponit.* P. Greg. I. Ep. 6.30. *Super ceteros Sacerdotes se extollit.* *ibid.* *Christi sibi student membra judicare.* P. Greg. I. Ep. 4.36. *Solus omnibus præfess.* Id. Ep. 4.38. — quibus (Episcopis) cupis remeti sum

And would he directly assume that to himself, which he chargeth on another, although only following his position by consequence?

And when Eulogius the Bishop of Alexandria had complementally said, *Sicut iussistis, As ye commanded;* He doth thus express his resentment; *That word of command I desire you let me not hear; because I know who I am, and who ye are; by place ye are my brethren, in goodness fathers; I did not therefore command, but what seem'd profitable, I hinted to you.*

That many such Instances may not be alledged out of Antiquity, the reason is, because the Ancient Popes did not understand this Power to belong to them, and therefore gave no occasion for Bishops to maintain their honour; or were more just, prudent and modest, than to take so much upon them as their Successors did, upon frivolous pretences.

VIII. The style used by the primitive Bishops in their applications to the Roman Bishop doth signify, that they did not apprehend him their Sovereign, but their equal.

Brother, Colleague, Fellow-bishop, are the terms which St. Cyprian doth use in speaking about the Roman Bishops, his contemporaries, Fabianus, Cornelius, Lucius, Stephanus; and in his Epistles to the three last of them; nor doth he ever use any other, importing higher respect due to them; as indeed his practice demonstrateth he did not apprehend any other due; or that he did take them for his Superiors in Office. Know now brother, was the compellation of Dionysius (Bishop of Alexandria) to Pope Stephanus. The Synod of Antioch, which rejected Paulus

Εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους ἰσίου καὶ ἀδελφικοῦ ὡς ἐστὶν πρὸς τὸ ἑκάστου ἑκείνου, ὡς γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως, ὡς γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως, ὡς γὰρ καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως. P. Jul. I. apud Athan. in Apol. 2. (p. 744.)

Qui tacer  
consentiri  
videtur.

Hic non tam optamus præponi aliis (sic  
ut prædicat) quam cum fidelibus cunctis  
sanctum & Deo placitum habere confor-  
tium. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 1 (ad Euphemium.)

In elatione sua  
Antichristum præ-  
currit,  
quia superbiendo

Quod verbum iussionis peto à meo auditu  
removeri; quia scio quis sum, quis estis;  
loco enim mihi fratres estis, moribus pa-  
tres, non ergo iussi, sed quæ utilis visa  
fuit, indicare curavi, &c. Greg. I. Ep. 7.  
30. (ad Eulog. Alex.)

Cypri Ep. 4.  
41. 58 67.  
63 45. 49.

Id est vult  
ἀδελφὸν, --  
lus Euseb 7.5.

Διονυσίου καὶ Μαξίμου καὶ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν  
οἰκουμενικῇ πᾶσι συλλειτουργοῖς ἡμῶν. Eu-  
feb. 7. 30.

The old Synod of

Ἰκανὰ μὲν τὰ γεγραμμένα παρὰ τοῦ  
ἀγαπῶντος καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ Δαμασκῶ. Athan.  
Ep. ad Afr. (p. 931.)

Τῷ μακαριστάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ Ἰουλίῳ.  
Marcell. ad P. Jul. Epiph. her. 72.

Ἀδελφὸν καὶ συλλειτουργὸν ἡμῶν τῷ Πά-  
μαιων Ἐκκλησιαστικῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ.  
Cyril ad Nest. in Syn. Eph. p. 207.

Τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις καὶ δσιωτάτοις ἀδελ-  
φοῖς συλλειτουργοῖς καὶ τῷ Ἰταλίαν καὶ Γαλ-  
λίαν ὁμοῖον Ἐπισκόπῳ. Bas. Ep. 69.  
Athanaf. Apol. 2. (p. 761. 756.)

Theod. 9. 9.  
Τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ συλλειτουργῷ ἡμῶν Κλε-  
σίμῳ. Syn. Eph. p. 217.

Domino dilectissimo & honoratissimo  
fratri. — Conc. Afr.

Domino dilectissimo & honorabili fratri  
Maximino. Aug. Ep. 203.

Κύριον ἀδελφόν, καὶ συλλειτουργόν Λιβερ-  
τίανον, Θεόφιλον, Σιλβανόν ἐν Κωνσταν-  
τινί. — Socr. 4. 12.

Τῷ δεσπότῃ μῶ. Conc. Eph. p. 202.  
Τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν καὶ συλλειτουργόν.  
Theod. 4. 9.

In which Instances, and some others of later date, we may observe that the word κύριος, or Dominus, was then (as it is now) barely a term of civility, being then usually given to any person of Quality, or to whom they would express common respect; so that St. Chrysostom in his Epistles commonly doth give it not only to meaner Bishops, but even

Cum ergo vel hoc ipso officio literarum  
per charitatem tibi serviam, non absurde  
te Dominum voco, propter unum & verum  
Dominum nostrum qui nobis ista praecepit.  
Aug. Ep. 103.

Δέσποτα μὲν τιμώμεν. Chryl. Ep. 26.  
Νῦν γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῷ Κυρίῳ μῶ τι-  
μώμεν καὶ ὑπακούομεν Πρεσβυτέρῳ. Chryl.  
Ep. 26.

Δεσπότῳ μὲν τιμώμεν Ἀνύσκλητον τὸν  
Πρεσβύτερον. Ep. 68 (71, 75, 77, 84, 91, &c.)

Κύριοι ἀδελφοί. P. Celest. I. Ep. ad Syn.  
Eph. Act. 2. (p. 324.)

Conc. 6. nople did inscribe according to the old style, to Pope Vitalianus, his  
Act. 13. brother and Fellow-minister.  
p. 224.

Scias nos non tuos esse, ut te iactas &  
exiollis, Clericos, quos ut fratres & Co-  
episcopos recognoscere si elatio permitteret,  
debueras. An. Franc. Pich. (An. 858.)

Such are the terms and titles which primitive integrity when they meant to speak most kindly and respectfully did allow the Pope, being the

lus Samosatenus, inscribeth its Epistle to Dionysius (then Bishop of Rome) and Maximus, and all our Fellow-ministers through the world.

Arles directeth their Epistle to Signiour Sylvester, their brother. Athanasius saith, These things may suffice, which have been written by our beloved and Fellow-minister Damasus Bishop of great Rome. Marcellus inscribed to Pope Julius, to his Most blessed Fellow-minister. So Cyril spake of Pope Celestine I. Our brother and Fellow-minister the Bishop of Rome. So St. Basil, and his Fellow-bishops of the East, did inscribe their Epistle, To the beloved of God, and our most holy brethren and Fellow-ministers, the unanimous Bishops, through Italy and France. In this style do the Fathers of Sardica salute Pope Julius; those of Constantinople Pope Damasus; those of Ephesus Pope Celestine I. our brother and Fellow-minister Celestine; those of Carthage Pope Celestine I. in the very same terms wherein St. Austin doth salute Maximinus, a Donatist Bishop, Signiour my beloved and most honoured brother. The Oriental Bishops, Eustathius, Theophilus and Sylvanus, did inscribe their Remonstrance to Pope Liberius, To Signiour our brother and Fellow-minister Liberius. So John of Antioch to Nestorius writeth, to my Master. The Synod of Illyricum call Elpidius, Our Seniour and Fellow-minister.

to Priests; and St. Austin doth thus salute even Donatist Bishops; reflecting thereon thus, Since therefore by charity I serve you in this Office of writing Letters to you, I do not improperly call you Master, for the sake of our one true Master who has commanded us so to do. — my most honour'd Master. — now therefore having with me my most honour'd Signiour and most reverend Presbyter, &c. — my most honour'd Master Asyncritus the elder.

Pope Celestine himself did salute the Ephesine Fathers, κύριοι ἀδελφοί, masters, brethren. Even in the VI. Council, Thomas Bishop of Constanti-

nople did inscribe according to the old style, to Pope Vitalianus, his brother and Fellow-minister.

The French Bishops had good reason to expostulate with Pope Nicholas I. You may know, that we are not, as you boast and brag, your Clerks; whom, if pride would suffer, you ought to acknowledge for your brethren and Fellow-bishops.

the same which all Bishops did give to one another; (as may be seen in all solemn addressees, and reports concerning them:) which is an Argument sufficiently plain, that Bishops in those times did not take themselves to be the Pope's Subjects, or his inferiors in Office; but his Fellows and Mates, co-ordinate in rank.

Were not these improper terms for an ordinary Gentleman, or Nobleman to accost his Prince in? yet hardly is there such a distance between any Prince and his Peers, as there is between a modern Pope and other Bishops.

It would now be taken for a great arrogance and sauciness, for an underling Bishop to address to the Pope in such language, or to speak of him in that manner; which is a sign that the World is altered in its notion of him, and that he beareth a higher conceit of himself than his primitive Ancestors did. Now nothing but *Beatissimus Pater*, most blessed Father, and *Dominus noster Papa*, our Lord the Pope, in the highest sense will satisfy him.

Now a Pope in a General Synod, in a solemn Oration, could be told to his Face, that the most Holy Senate of Cardinals had chosen a Brother into a Father, a Collegue into a Lord. Verily so it is now, but not so anciently.

*Verè divi-  
nā provi-  
dentiā fa-  
ctum cen-  
sendum est, quod te facerrimus iste Senatus — Fratrem, & ita dixerim Filium in Patrem, Collegam in Domi-  
num — elegerint, assumpserint, adoraverint. Balt. Delrio. in Conc. Later. ad Leonem X. Sess. 8. (p. 85.)*

In the same ancient times, the style of the Roman Bishops writing to other Bishops was the same; he calling them Brethren and Fellow-ministers.

So did *Cornelius* write to *Fabius of Antioch*, beloved brother; so did he call all other Bishops, — be it known to all our Fellow-bishops and brethren. So *Julius* to the Oriental Bishops, To our beloved brethren. So *Liberius* to the Macedonian Bishops, To our beloved brethren and Fellow-ministers: and to the Oriental Bishops, To our brethren and Fellow-bishops. So *Damasus* to the Bishops of *Illyricum*. So *Leo* himself frequently in his Epistles. So Pope *Celestine* calleth *John of Antioch*, Most honoured brother; to *Cyril* and to *Nestorius* himself, Beloved brother; to the Fathers of *Ephesus*, Signiours brethren. Pope *Gelasius* to the Bishops of *Dardania*, Your brotherhood. *St. Gregory* to *Cyriacus*, Our brother and Fellow-priest, *Cyriacus*.

*Ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπῆ.* Euseb. 6.43.  
Omnibus Co-episcopis nostris & fratribus innotescat. P. Corn. apud Cypr. Epist. 43.

*Ἀγαπητοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.* Athan. p. 739.  
*Ἀγαπητοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ συλλειτουργοῖς.* Socr. 4. 12.

*Fratribus & Co-episcopis.* Hil. frag. p. 450.  
Soc. 6. 23.

*Τιμωτάτῃ ἀδελφῇ.* Conc. Eph. p. 196.

*Τῷ ἀγαπῷ ἀδελφῷ.* p. 179, 183.

*Κύριε ἀδελφῷ.* Ag. 2. p. 324.

*Fraternitas Vestra.* P. Gelas. Ep. 12.  
Greg. — Epist. 6. 24. *Fratri & Con-sacerdoti nostri Cyriaci.*

If it be said the Popes did write so then out of condescension, or humility and modesty; it may be replied, that if really there was such a difference as is now pretended, it may seem rather affectation, and indecency or mockery: for it would have more become the Pope to maintain the majesty and authority of his place, by appellations apt to cherish their reverence, than to colloque with them in terms void of reality; or signifying that equality which he did not mean.

But *Bellarmino* hath found out one instance (which he maketh much of) of Pope *Damasus*, who writing (not as he alledgeth, to the Fathers of *Constantinople*, \* but) to certain Eastern Bishops, calleth them most honoured Sons. That whole Epistle I do fear to be foisted into *Theodoret*; for it cometh in abruptly; and doth not much become such a man:

*Bell. 3. 14.  
Theod. 5.  
10.  
\* Valef. in  
Theod. ib.  
ὁὐκ ἐπιμέ-  
ται.*

and



and if it be supposed genuine, I should suspect some corruption in the place; for why, if he writ to Bishops, should he use a style so unsuitable to those times, and so different from that of his Predecessors, and Successors? why should there be such a disparity between his own style now and at other times? for writing to the Bishops of *Illyricum* he calleth them, *beloved brethren*; why then is he so inconstant and partial, as to yield these *Oriental Bishops* less respect? wherefore perhaps *ὑοὶ* was thrust in for *ἀδελφοί* or perhaps the word *ἐπισκόποις* was intruded, and he did write to Lay-men; \* *those who governed the East*, who well might be called *most honoured Sons*; otherwise the *Epithet* doth not seem well to sute; but however, a single example of arrogance or stateliness, (or of what shall I call it?) is not to be set against so many modest and mannerly ones.

\* Ἀγαπῶντες  
ἀδελφοί.  
Soz. 6.23.

\* Τοῖς  
ἰσὺν ἰδοῦ-  
ται.

In fine, that this Salutation doth not always imply Superiority, we

\* Ἀγαπῶν ὑπὲρ καὶ ὁμοῦ λόγῳ συλλειτουργῶν  
ὑπὲρ Ἀθανασίου. Apud Athan. Apol. 2.  
p. 783.

may be assured by that inscription of *Alexander*, Bishop of *Theffalonica*, to *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, *To my beloved Son and unanimous Colleague Athanasius*.

IX. The ground of that eminence, which the *Roman Bishop* did obtain in the Church, so as in order to precede other Bishops, doth shake this pretence.

Ecclesia  
principalis.  
Ist. Cypri.  
Ep. 55.

The Church of *Rome* was indeed allowed to be the *principal Church*, as *St. Cyprian* calleth it; but why? was it preferred by Divine Institution? no surely, Christianity did not make Laws of that nature, or constitute differences of places. Was it in regard to the succession of *St. Peter*? no; that was a slim upstart device; that did not hold in *Antioch*, nor in other Apostolical Churches.

But it was for a more substantial reason; the very same, on which the dignity and preeminency of other Churches was founded; that is, the dignity, magnitude, opulency, opportunity of that City in which the Bishop of *Rome* did preside; together with the consequent numerousness, quality and wealth of his flock; which gave him many great advantages above other his Fellow-bishops: It was (saith *Rigaltius*) called

Ecclesia principalis, id est in urbe principalis constituta. Rigalt. in Cypri. Ep. 55.

by *St. Cyprian* the principal Church, because constituted in the principal City.

Διὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίαν πλείους τῶν καὶ ἁγιωτέρων ἀειδωτός καὶ μαρτυρῶν καὶ ἀναριθμη-  
ται αὐτῷ. Euseb. 6.43.

That Church in the very times of severest Persecutions, by the providence of God (as *Pope Cornelius* said in his Epistle to *Fabius*) had a rich and plentiful number, with a most great and innumerable people; so that he reckoneth forty four Presbyters, seven Deacons, (in imitation of the number in the *Acts*.) seven Sub-deacons, forty two Acoluthi, fifty two others of the inferior Clergy, and above fifteen hundred Alms-people.

Et quamquam sciam, frater, pro mutua dilectione quam debemus & exhibemus invicem nobis florentissimo illic Clero tecum presidenti, & sanctissima atque amplissima plebi, legere te semper literas nostras — Cypri. Ep. 55. (ad Corn.)

To that Church there must needs have been a great resort of Christians, going to the seat of the Empire in pursuit of business; as in proportion there was to each other *Metropolis*; according to that Canon of the *Antiochene Synod*, which ordered, that the Bishop of each *Metropolis* should take care of the whole Province, because all that had business did resort to the *Metropolis*.

Καὶ τὴν γεννίαν ἀναδύσαντες τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς.  
Διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει συντρέχειν πάντας καὶ τὰ πνευματικά ἐκείνης. Syn.  
Ant. Can. 9.

That

That Church was most able to yield help and succour to them who needed it; and accordingly did use to do it; according to that of *Dionysius* (Bishop of *Corinth*) in his Epistle to Bishop *Soter* of *Rome*; This (saith he) is your custom from the beginning, in divers ways to do good to the brethren, and to send supplies to many Churches in every City, so refreshing the poverty of those who want

Ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐδόθη τὸτο, πάντας μὲν ἀδελφούς ποικίλως ἐνεργέειν, Ἑκκλησίας τε πολλὰς καὶ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐφοδία πῦμπεν, ὥστε μὲν τῶν ἡμῶν δούλων πᾶσαν ἀναψύχουσαν, &c. *Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. 4.23.*

Whence it is no wonder, that the Head of that Church did get most reputation, and the privilege of precedence without competition.

To this Church (saith *Irenæus*) it is necessary that every Church (that is, the faithful who are all about) should resort, because of its more powerful principality; what is meant by that resort, will be easy to him, who considereth how men here are wont to go up to *London*, drawn thither by interests of Trade, Law, &c. What he did understand by more powerful principality, the words themselves do signify, which exactly do agree to the Power and Grandure of the Imperial City; but do not well sute to the Authority of a Church; especially then when no Church did appear to have either Principality or Puissance. And that sence may clearly be evinced by the context, wherein it doth appear, that *St. Irenæus* doth not alledge the judicial Authority of the *Roman* Church, but its credible Testimony, which thereby became more considerable, because Christians commonly had occasions of recourse to it.

Ad hanc Ecclesiam, propter potentiorē principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt ubique fideles. *Iren. 3. 3.*

(Δυνατωτέρῃ ἀρχῇ, I conjecture he said.)

Such a reason of precedence *St. Cyprian* giveth in another case, Because (saith he) *Rome* for its magnitude out to precede *Carthage*.

Quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma precedere. *Cyprian. Ep. 49.*

For this reason a Pagan Historian did observe the *Roman* Bishop had a greater authority (that is, a greater interest and reputation) than other Bishops.

Auctoritate qua potiores eterne urbis Episcopi. *Amm. Marcell. lib. 15. (p. 47.)*

This reason *Theodore* doth assign in his Epistle to Pope *Leo*, wherein he doth highly complement and cajole him; for this City (saith he) is the greatest, and most splendid, and presiding over the world; and flowing with multitude of people; and which moreover hath produced the Empire now governing. ---

Ἡ γὰρ αὐτὴ πασῶν μεγίστη, καὶ λαμπροτάτη, καὶ οἰκουμένης προκαθημένη, καὶ τῶ πλῆθι ἡμῶν οἰκιστῶν κυμαίνουσα. ὅθεν καὶ τούτοις καὶ νυνὶ κεκοιτίσθαι ἡγεμονίαν ἐβλάστησεν. *Theod. Ep. 113.*

This is the sole ground upon which the greatest of all ancient Synods, that of *Chalcedon*, did affirm the Papal eminency to be founded; for to the throne (say they) of ancient *Rome*, because that was the royal City, the Fathers reasonably conferred the privileges: the fountain of Papal eminence was in their judgment not any divine Institution, not the Authority of Saint *Peter* deriving it self to his Successors; but the concession of the Fathers, who were moved to grant it upon account that *Rome* was the Imperial City.

Τῷ δεῖνῳ δὲ προσκυττός τῷ Ῥώμῃ διὰ τὸ βασιλεῖον ἐν πόλει ἐκείνῃ οἱ Πατέρες οὐκ ὀκνῶντες ἀποδιδῶναι τὰ πρεσβυτεία. *Syn. Chalced. 16 Can. 28.*

To the same purpose the Empress *Placidia*, in her Epistle to *Theodosius* in behalf of Pope *Leo*, saith, It becometh us to preserve to this City (the which is mistress of all lands) a reverence in all things.

Πρέπῃ ἡμῖν ταύτῃ τῇ μεγίστῃ πόλει, ἥτις διακονεῖ πασῶν ὑπαρχῶν τῶν γυνών, ἐν παντί τὸ σέβας ἀσφραδίζεσθαι. *Placid. in Syn. Chalced. p. 27.*

This reason had indeed in it much of equity, of decency, of convenience; it was equal that he should have the preference, and more than

common respect, who was thence enabled and engaged to do most service to Religion. It was decent, that out of conformity to the State, and in respect to the Imperial Court and Senate, the Pastor of that place should be graced with repute; it was convenient, that he who resided in the centre of all business, and had the greatest influence upon affairs, who was the Emperor's chief Councillor for direction, and Instrument for execution of Ecclesiastical affairs, should not be put behind others.

Τὸν μὲντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τὴν μὲν καὶ τὴν Ῥώμης Ἐπίσκοπον διὰ τὸ ἔχειν αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην. Syn. Const. Can. 3.

Τὰ ἰσα πρεσβεία ἐπὶνεύει τῷ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀρχιεπίτῳ θρόνῳ, ἐκλήγας κείνους τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ συλλήγας τιμωδεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τὴν ἰσὺν ἀπαιτούσαν πρεσβείαν τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλείᾳ Ῥώμης, καὶ ἐν τοῖς Ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς ὡς ἐκείνῳ μεγαλύνειται πρεσβυσίαι, δίδωσιν αὐτῇ ἐκείνῳ ἀνὰ χροῖον. Syn. Chal. Can. 28.

Sacrofan-  
dam quo-  
que hujus  
religiosissi-  
me civi-  
tatis Ec-  
clesiam.

Indeed upon this score the Church of Constantinople is said to have aspired to the supreme Principality, when it had the advantage over old Rome, the Empire being extinguished there; and sometime was styled, the Head of all Churches.

The Holy Church of this most religious City, the Mother of our devotion, and of all orthodox Christians, and the most holy See of that imperial City.

Bonifacius III. à Phoca Imperatore obtinuit, magnam tamen contentione, ut sedes B. Petri Apostoli, quæ caput est omnium Ecclesiarum, ita & diceretur, & haberetur ab omnibus; quem quidem locum Ecclesia Constantinopolitana sibi vendicare conabatur; faventibus interdum Principibus, affirmantibusq; eo loci primam sedem esse debere, ubi Imperii caput esset. Plat. in Bonif. III. (p. 161.)

Boniface III. (though with a great deal of stir) obtained of the Emperor Phocas, that the See of Saint Peter the Apostle, which is the head of all Churches, should be so called and accounted by all; which dignity the Church of Constantinople did indeed endeavour to assert to it self. Princes sometimes favouring them, and affirming that there the chief See ought to be where the head of the Empire was.

Phocas rogante Papâ Bonifacio statuit sedem Romanæ Ecclesiæ caput esse omnium Ecclesiarum, quia Ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium Ecclesiarum scribebat. Anast. in Bonif. III. Idem Sabellicus, Blondus, Lætus, &c. tradunt.

Phocas at the entreaty of Pope Boniface appointed that the Roman See should be the head of all Churches, because the Church of Constantinople wrote her self the chief of all Churches.

It is also natural and can hardly be otherwise, but that the Bishop of a chief City, finding himself to exceed in wealth, in power, in advantages of friendships, dependencies, &c. should not affect to raise himself above the level: it is an ambition, that easily will seize on the most moderate, and otherwise religious minds. Pope Leo objected it to Anatolius, and Pope Gregory to John (from his austere life called the Faster.)

Upon the like account it was, that the Bishops of other Cities did mount to a preeminency, Metropolitan, Primatical, Patriarchal.

Thence it was that the Bishop of Alexandria before Constantine's time, did acquire the honour of second place to Rome; because that City, being head of a most rich and populous Nation, did in magnitude and opulency (as Gregory Nazianzene saith) approach next to Rome, so as hardly to yield the next place to it.

Ἰμῶς ἡ  
μεγάλη  
πόλις, οἱ  
μὲν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνῳ,  
ἡ μὲν δὲ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡρώδης.  
2. 4. & passim.

Greg. Naz. Orat. 27. Ἡ Ἀλεξανδρία μεγάλη πόλις, Ἐνὰ γρ.

Upon





ἔφερον ὡς καὶ πᾶσι φιλοπονοῦντες ἡ Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίαν ἐν ταῖς γερουσίαις ἀπο-  
λόγων, ὡς Ἀποστόλων θεοτεκνίων καὶ ἐν-  
σθεσίαις Μητροπόλεων καὶ ἀρχαῖς γερουσιῶν.  
καὶ καὶ ἐξ ἧς ἐκαστοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ πρὸ  
δογματῶν ἐξήρχοντο· καὶ παρὰ τὸτο ὅ  
τι διὰ τὴν εἰρήνην ἡμεῖς ἐπὶ μὴ μεγέ-  
θει ἢ πλῶδει Ἐκκλησίας πλεονεκτοῦσιν.  
Soz. 3. 8.

rourness of their Church. They allowed some regard (though faintly and with reservation) to the Roman Church upon account of their Apostolical foundation; they implied a stronger ground of pretence from the grandeur of that City; yet did not they therefore grant themselves to be inferiors; at least as to any substantial Privilege, importing Authority.

If by Divine right, upon account of his succession to Saint Peter, he had such preeminence, why are the other causes reckoned, as if they could add any thing to God's Institution, or as if that did need humane confirmation? The pretence to that surely was weak, which did need corroboration, and to be propp'd by worldly considerations.

Indeed, whereas the Apostles did found many Churches, exercising Apostolical authority over them (eminently containing the Episcopal) why in conscience should one claim privileges on that score rather than, or above the rest?

Τὴς ἀρε-  
σούτης  
καὶ ἐν  
Ῥώμῃ  
Ἀποστο-  
λικῆς Ἐκ-  
κλησίας—

Why should the See of Antioch, that most ancient and truly Apostolical Church, where the Christian name began, where Saint Peter at first (as they say) did sit Bishop for seven years, be postponed to Alex-  
andria?

Ep. Synod. Const. Theodoret. hist. l. 5. c. 9. p. 211. *Que quantumlibet à Petro ante Alexandrinam fuerat instituta, tamen quoniam præfecturâ Alexandrina Augustinus dicta ——— longè præstabat Syria præfectura, &c.* Baron. Ann. 39. §. 10.

Epiph. Synod. Constant. ibid.

Τὴς δὲ καὶ μητρὸς ἀπαστῶν τῶν Ἐκκλη-  
σιῶν ἢ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις.

Optat. l. 6.  
(p. 169.)  
Hier. Ep.  
61. Conc.  
Nic. Can. 7.

Majores enim in instituendis sedibus  
Ecclesiarum non aliam inuisse rationem,  
quam secundum divisionem Provinciarum,  
& Prærogativas à Romanis antea stabili-  
tas, quam plurima sunt exempla. Baron.  
anno 39. 10.

Especially why should the Church of Jerusa-  
lem, the Seat of our Lord himself, the mother of  
all Churches, the fountain of Christian Doctrine,  
the first Consistory of the Apostles, ennobled by

so many glorious performances (by the Life, Preaching, Miracles, Death, Burial, Resurrection, Ascension of our Saviour; by the first preaching of the Apostles, the effusion of the Holy Spirit, the Conversion of so many People, and Constitution of the first Church, and Celebration of the first Synods) upon these considerations not obtain preeminence to other Churches, but in honour be cast behind divers others; and as to Power be subjected to Casarea, the Metropolis of Palestine?

The true reason of this even Baronius himself did see and acknowledge; for that (saith he) the Ancients observ'd no other rule in instituting the Ecclesiastical Sees, than the division of Provinces, and the Prerogative before established by the Romans, there are very many examples.

Of which examples, that of Rome is the most obvious and notable; and what he so generally asserteth may be so applied thereto, as to void all other grounds of its preeminence.

X. The truth is, all Ecclesiastical presidencies and subordinations, or dependencies of some Bishops on others in administration of spiritual affairs were introduced merely by humane Ordinance, and established by

by Law or Custom, upon prudential accounts, according to the exigency of things: Hence the Prerogatives of other Sees did proceed; and hereto whatever Dignity, Privilege, or Authority the Pope with equity might at any time claim, is to be imputed.

To clear which point, we will search the matter nearer the quick; propounding some observations concerning the ancient forms of Discipline, and considering what interest the Pope had therein.

At first each Church was settled apart under its own Bishop and Presbyters; so as independently and separately to manage its own concerns; each was *αὐτοκέφαλον*, and *αὐτόνομον*, governed by its own head, and had its own Laws. Every Bishop as a Prince in his own Church, did act freely according to his will and discretion, with the advice of his Ecclesiastical Senate, and \* with the consent of his people (the which he did use to consult) without being controllable by any other, or accountable to any, farther than his obligation to uphold the verity of Christian profession, and to maintain fraternal communion in charity and peace with neighboring Churches did require, in which regard if he were notably peccant, he was liable to be disclaimed by them, as no good Christian, and rejected from communion, together with his Church, if it did adhere to him in his misdemeanors. This may be collected from the remainders of State in the times of St. Cyprian.

But because little, disjointed and incoherent Bodies were like dust, apt to be dissipated by every wind of external assault, or intestine faction; and peaceable union could hardly be retained without some ligature of discipline; and Churches could not mutually support and defend each other without some method of intercourse and rule of confederacy, engaging them: Therefore for many good purposes (for upholding and advancing the common interests of Christianity, for protection and support of each Church from inbred disorders and dissensions; for preserving the integrity of the Faith, for securing the concord of divers Churches, for providing fit Pastors to each Church, and correcting such as were scandalously bad \* or unfaithful) it was soon found needful, that divers Churches should be combined and linked together in some regular form of Discipline; † that if any Church did want a Bishop, the neighbour Bishops might step in to approve

\* Cypr. Ep. 53. 55. 72. 73. 76.

*Omnis hic actus populo erat infinuandus. P. Corn. apud Cypr. Ep. 46.*

All this business was to have been imparted to the people.

*Secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum, & omnium nostrum commune consilium — ea quæ agenda sunt disponere. Cypr. Ep. 40. (Plebi Univ.)*

To order what was to be done according to your judgment, and the common advice of us all.

*Et limanda plenius ratio non solum cum Collegis meis, sed & cum plebe ipsa universa. Cypr. Ep. 28.*

And the reason is more thoroughly to be examined not only with my Collegues, but with the whole people.

*Præjudicare ego & soli mihi rem communem vindicare non audeo. Ep. 18.*

I dare not therefore prejudge, nor assume to my self alone a matter which is common to all.

*Hoc enim & verecundia & disciplina & vita ipsi omnium nostrum convenit, ut Episcopi plures in unum convenientes, præsentem & stantem plebe, (quisbus & ipsis pro fide & timore suo honor habendus est) disponere omnia consilia communi religione possimus. Ep. 14.*

For it becomes the modesty, the discipline, and the manner of our living, that many Bishops meeting together, the people being also present, (to whom respect ought to be had for their faith and fear) we may order all things with the common advice.

— quoniam non paucorum, nec Ecclesie unius aut unius Provinciae, sed totius orbis hæc causa est. — Cypr. Ep. 14.

— because this is the concern not of a few men or one Church, or one Province, but of the whole world.

*Idcirco copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum — ut si quis ex Collegio nostro hæresin facere, & gregem Christi lacere & vastare connaverit, subveniant ceteri — Cypr. Ep. 76.*

Therefore the Clergy is a large body — that if any one of our own society should vent an heresy, and attempt to rent and waste the flock of Christ, the rest might come in to their help.

\* Particularly in the dispensation of Church goods. Conc. Ant. Can. 25.

† Nov. 137. cap. 4. }  
123. cap. 10. }

and



\* *Vid. Can. Apost. 38. (al. 30.) de Synodis.*

and ordain a fit one; \* that if any Bishop did notoriously swerve from the Christian rule, the others might interpose to correct or void him: that if any error, or schism did peep up in any Church, the joynt concurrence of divers Bishops might avail to stop its progress, and to quench it; by convenient means of instruction, reprehension and censure: that if any Church were oppressed by persecution, by indigency, by faction; the others might be engaged to afford effectual succour and relief; for such ends it was needful, that Bishops in certain precincts should convene, with intent to deliberate and resolve about the best expedients to compass them; And that the manner of such proceeding, (to avoid uncertain distraction, confusion, arbitrariness, dissatisfaction and mutinous opposition) should be settled in an ordinary course; according to rules known and allowed by all.

(οικονομίας  
ἐκκλησια-  
στικαί.  
Syn Const.  
Can. 2.)

In defining such precincts it was most natural, most easy, most commodious to follow divisions of Territory, or Jurisdiction already established in the Civil State; that the Spiritual administrations being in such circumstances aptly conformed to the Secular might go on more smoothly and expeditely, the wheels of one not clashing with the

Εἰ δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκτα-  
νείη πόλεις, ἢ αὐτὰς ἐπανιδεῖν, τοῖς πολιτι-  
κοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τόποις καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησιαστι-  
κῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθεῖτω. Conc.  
Chalced. Can. 17. & Conc. Trull. Can.  
38.

other: according to the judgment of the two great Synods, that of Chalcedon, and the Trullane; which did ordain, that *if by Royal authority any City be or should hereafter be re-established, the order of the Churches shall be according to the civil and publick form.*

P. Anacl.  
dist. 99  
cap. 1. P.  
Greg. VII.  
Ep. 6. 35.

Whereas therefore in each Nation or Province subject to one Political Jurisdiction there was a *Metropolis* or *Head-city*, to which the greatest resort was for dispensation of Justice, and dispatch of principal Affairs emergent in that Province; it was also most convenient, that also the determination of Ecclesiastical matters should be affixed thereto; especially considering that usually those places were opportunely seated; that many persons upon other occasions did meet there; that the Churches in those Cities did exceed the rest in number, in opulency, in ability and opportunity to promote the common interest in all kinds of advantages.

*Ad hoc divine dispensationis provisto gradus & diversos constituit ordines in se distinctos, ut dum reverentiam minores potioribus exhiberent, & potiores minoribus diligentiam impenderent, una concordia fieret à diversitate contentio & rectè officiorum gereretur administratio singulorum. Joh VIII. Ep. 95.*

To this end divine providence hath appointed degrees and divers orders distinct from one another, that while the less reverence the greater, and the greater take care of the less, from this diversity there might arise one frame of concord, and all offices be daily administered.

Moreover because in all Societies and Confederacies of men for ordering publick affairs, (for the settling things in motion, for effectual dispatch, for preventing endless dissensions and confusions both in resolving upon and executing things) it is needful that one person should be authorized to preside among the rest, unto whom the power and care should be entrusted to convoke Assemblies in fit season, to propose matters for consultation, to moderate the debates and proceedings, to declare the result, and to see that what is agreed upon may be duly executed; Such a charge then naturally would de-

volve it self upon the Prelate of the *Metropolis*, as being supposed constantly present on the place; as being at home in his own seat of presidence, and receiving the rest under his wing; as incontestably surpassing others in all advantages answerable to the secular advantages of his City; for that it was unseemly and hard, if he at home should be postponed in dignity to others repairing thither; for that also commonly he

was

was in a manner the spiritual Father of the rest, ( Religion being first planted in great Cities, and thence propagated to others ) so that the reverence and dependance on Colonies to the mother City was due from other Churches to his See.

Wherefore by consent of all Churches, grounded on such obvious reason of things, the presidency in each Province was assigned to the Bishop of the *Metropolis*, who was called the first Bishop, the *Metropolitan*, ( in some places the \* *Primate*, the *Archbishop*, the *Patriarch*, the *Pope* ) of the Province. The Apostolical Canons call him the first Bishop (which sheweth the Antiquity of this Institution:) the *African Synods* did appoint that name to him as most modest, and calling him *Primate* in that sense; other ancient Synods style him the *Metropolit*; and to the *Metropolitans* of the principal Cities they gave the Title of *Archbishop*. The Bishops of *Rome* and *Alexandria* peculiarly were called *Popes*; although that name was sometimes deferred to any other Bishop.

During this state of things the whole Church did consist of so many Provinces, being *αυτοκέφαλοι*, independent on each other in Ecclesiastical administrations; each reserving to it self the constitution of Bishops, the convocation of Synods, the enacting of Canons, the decision of Causes, the definition of Questions; yet so that each Province did hold peaceful and amicable correspondence with others; upon the like terms as before each *παρεκκλήσια*, or Episcopal precinct did hold intercourse with its neighbours.

And whoever in any Province did not comply with, or submit to the Orders and Determinations resolved upon in those Assemblies, was deemed a schismatical, contentious and contumelious person; with good reason, because he did thwart a Discipline plainly conducive to publick good; because declining such judgments he plainly shewed that he would admit none, (there not being any fairer way of determining things than by common advice and agreement of Pastors) because he did in effect refuse all good terms of communion and peace.

Thus I conceive the *Metropolit* governance was introduced, by humane prudence following considerations of publick necessity or utility: There are indeed some, who think it was instituted by the Apostles; but their Arguments do not seem convincing, and such a constitution doth not (as I take it) well suite to the state of their times, and the course they took in founding Churches.

Into such a Chancel, through all parts of *Christendom* (though with some petty differences in the methods and measures of acting) had Ecclesiastical administrations fallen of themselves; plain community of reason, and imitation insensibly propagating that course; and therein it ran for a good time, before it was by general consent and solemn sanction established.

The whole Church then was a Body consisting of several confederations of Bishops, acting in behalf of their Churches under their respective *Metropolitans*, who did manage the common affairs in each Province; convoking Synods at stated times, and upon emergent occasions; in them deciding Causes and Controversies incident, relating to faith or practice; framing Rules serviceable to common Edification, and decent Uniformity in God's service; quashing Here-

\* *Primas Provinciae. Cod. Afr. Can. 19.*

Τὸς Ἐπισκοπὸν ἑκάστης ἐκκλησίας εἰδέναι χρὴ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον. *Can. Apost. 27.*

The Bishops of each Nation ought to know who is chief among them.

*Cod. Afr. Can. 39. Dist. 99. cap. 3.*

Παράταξις  
Syn. Nic.  
Can. 18.

*Can. Apost. 38.*  
*Tertull. de Jej. cap. 13.*  
*Syn. Nic. Can. 5.*

Διὰ τὰς Ἐκκλησιαστικὰς χρείας καὶ τὰς ἡ ἀμφισβητημάτων διαλύσεις—*Syn. Ant. Can. 20.*

lies

fies and Schifms, declaring truths impugned or questioned; maintaining the harmony of communion and concord with other Provinces adjacent or remote.

Such was the state of the Church, unto which the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions do refer, answerable to the times in which they were framed; and which we may discern in the practice of ancient Synods.

Παλαὶος τε ὡς ἵτε θεοῦ κελεύσμα, καὶ  
ἐπὶ ἀγίων ἐν Νίκαια Πατρῶν ὅς  
Syn. Constant. Theod. 5.9.

Ἰπὲρ τῶ πάντα ἐν πάσῃ περιουσίᾳ  
ὁμοίως φυλάττειται Can. 26.

Such it did continue, when the great Synod of *Nice* was celebrated, which by its authority (presumed to represent the authority of all Bishops in the World, who were summoned thereto (backed by the Imperial Authority and Power, did confirm those Orders, as they found them standing by more general custom, and received Rules in most Provinces; reducing them into more uniform practice; so that what before stood upon reason,

customary usage, particular consent, by so august sanction did become universal Law; and did obtain so great veneration, as by some to be conceived everlastingly and immutably obligatory; according to those maxims of Pope *Leo*.

It is here farther observable, that whereof divers Provinces did hold communion and intercourse; so that upon occasion they did (by their formed Letters) render to one another an account of their proceedings, being of great moment, especially of those which concerned the general state of Christianity, and common Faith; calling, when need was, for assistance one of another to resolve points of faith, or to settle order and peace; there was in so doing a special respect given to the *Metropolitans* of great Cities: and to prevent dissensions, which naturally ambition doth prompt men to, grounded upon degrees of respect, an Order was fixed among them, according to which in subscriptions of Letters, in accidental congresses, and the like occasions, some should precede others; (that distinction being chiefly and commonly grounded on the greatness, splendor, opulency of Cities; or following the secular dignity of them:) whence *Rome* had the first place, *Alexandria* the second, *Antioch* the third, *Hierusalem* the fourth, &c.

Zol. lib. 2.  
p. 63.  
Sextus  
Rufus,  
Brev.

Afterward, *Constantine* having introduced a new partition of the *Empire*, whereby divers Provinces were combined together into one Territory, under the regiment of a *Vicar*, or a *Lieutenant* of a *Præfectus-prætorio*, which Territory

Ἐπικολέουσι τὸ ἑξάρχου μιν. Syn. Chalc.  
Act. 10. p. 388.  
Διοικητῆς. Epist. Orient. ad Rufum, in  
Syn. Eph. p. 396.

Dist. 99. cap. 1.2.  
Οἱ ἐσιώτατοι Πατριάρχαι διοικήτως  
ἐλάτουν. Syn. Chalc. Act. 2 (p. 211.)

Ephesi διέτατον Πατριάρχων. Ev. 3.6.  
Τίς ἐστὶν ἑξάρχης τοῦ διοικητοῦ τοῦ  
Πατριάρχου παρὶ. Zon. ad 28. Can.  
Chalc.

Novell. 137. cap. 5. & 123. cap. 10.  
P. Greg. I. Ep. 11. 56.

Ordo Episcoporum quadripartitus est,  
id est, in Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Metro-  
politaniis, atque Episcopis. Mld. dist. 21.  
cap. 1.

Dionysius Ex. translates ἑξάρχον, Pri-  
matem, in Syn. Chalc. Can. 9, & 17.

was called a *Diocese*; the Ecclesiastical state was adapted in conformity thereto; new Ecclesiastical Systems, and a new sort of spiritual Heads thence springing up; so that in each Diocese, consisting of divers Provinces an Ecclesiastical *Exarch* (otherwise sometimes called a *Primate*, sometimes a *Diocesan*, sometimes a *Patriarch*) was constituted, answerable to the Civil *Exarch* of a Diocese; who by such constitution did obtain a like Authority over the *Metropolitans* of Provinces, as they had in their Province over the Bishops of Cities; so that it appertained to them to call together the Synods of the whole Diocese, to preside in them, and in them to dispatch the principal affairs concerning that precinct, to ordain *Metropolitans*, to confirm the Ordinations of Bishops, to decide Causes and



and Controversies between Bishops upon appeal from Provincial Synods.

Some conceive the Synod of *Nice* did establish it; but that can hardly well be; for that Synod was held about the time of that division, (after that *Constantine* was settled in a peaceful enjoyment of the Empire) and scarce could take notice of so fresh a change in the State; that doth not pretend to innovate, but professeth in its sanctions specially to regard ancient custom, saving to the Churches their privileges of which they were possessed; that only mentioneth Provinces, and representeth the *Metropolitans* in them as the chief Governors Ecclesiastical then being; that constituteth a peremptory decision of weighty causes in Provincial Synods, which is consistent with the *Dio-*  
*cesan* Authority; that taketh no notice of *Con-*  
*stantinople*, the principal Diocese in the East, as seat of the Empire; (and the Synod of *Antioch*, insisting in the footsteps of the *Nicene*, doth touch only *Metropolitans* (Can. 19.) and the Synod of *Laodicea* doth only suppose that Order.)

In fine, that Synod is not recorded by any old Historian to have framed such an alteration; which indeed was so considerable, that *Eusebius* who was present there could not well have passed it over in silence.

Of this opinion was the Synod of *Carthage* in their Epistle to Pope *Celestine* I. who understood no jurisdiction but that of *Metropolitans* to be constituted in the *Nicene* Synod.

Some think the Fathers of the Second General Synod did introduce it, seeing it expedient that Ecclesiastical administrations should correspond to the Political; for they did innovate somewhat in the form of Government; they do expressly use the new word *Diocese*, according to the Civil sense, as distinct from a Province; they do distinctly name the particular *Dioceses* of the *Oriental* Empire, as they stood in the Civil establishment; they do prescribe to the Bishops in each *Diocese* to act unitedly there, not skipping over the bounds of it; they order a kind of appeal to the Synod of the *Diocese*, prohibiting other appeals: The Historians expressly do report of them, that they did distinguish and distribute *Dioceses*, that they did constitute *Patriarchs*, that they did prohibit that any of one *Diocese* should intrude upon another.

τῶ Ἐπισκόπῳ, τότε αὐτὸν προσεῖναι μίζονι Συνοδῷ τῇ διοικήσεως Ἐπισκόπων οὐκ ἐν τῇ αἰτίᾳ ταύτῃ συζητημένων — Syn Const. Can. 6.

But if it so happen that the Bishops of any Province cannot rectify those things which are laid to the charge of a Bishop, they shall then go to a greater Synod of the Bishops of that Diocese, met together for that purpose.

The Fathers of *Constantinople* in their Synodick Epistle distinguish the Province and Diocese of *Antioch*, οἱ τῆ τῆς ἐπαρχίας, καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως Συνοδομόντες — Theod. 5.9.

καὶ Πατριάρχας κατέστησαν διηγεμένους τὰς ἐπαρχίας. Socr. 5.8.

Ἐν οὐκείῃ γὰρ τῇ βασιλεύσει πολλὰ Συνεδόσεις οἱ μακάριοι Πατέρες συμφώνως τοῖς ἐν τῇ Νικίᾳ Συνεδροῦσιν τὰς διοικήσεις διέκριναν, καὶ ἐκάστην διοίκησιν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀνένεμαν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαρρηθόντος ὧς ἐπὶ τινὲς τιμὰς διοικήσεως ἵπτα μὴ ἐπιναί. Theodor. Ep 86. (ad Flavianum.)

For, says *Theodor*, the Blessed Fathers meeting together in the Imperial City, distinguished Dioceses agreeably to what the *Nicene* Fathers had done, and allotted to every Diocese what belonged to it: on the contrary charging that no one of one Diocese should encroach upon another.

But if we shall attently search and scan passages, we may perhaps find reason to judge, that this form did soon after the Synod of *Nice* creep in without any solemn appointment by spontaneous assumption and submission, accommodating things to the Political course; the great Bishops (who by the amplification of their City in power, wealth and course

Ὁ δὲ ἄρ' ὅτε ὁ κανὼν, ὅτε ἡ Συνόδος παρὰ δὲ καὶ — Can. 18.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔδωκεν. Can. 6.

Ἐπειδὴ Συνόδους κατέστηκα καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαῖα — Can 7.

Ομοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἄλλῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ τὰ προσέβητα ὧς ἐπὶ Ἐκκλησίας. Ibid.

Τὰς Ἐπισκόπους καὶ τῇ Μητροπολίτι, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ Ἐπισκόπων καὶ ἱεραδὶ — Syn. Laod. Can. 12.

The Bishops should be constituted by the judgment of the Metropolitans and the neighbouring Bishops.

Εἰ δὲ συμβαίῃ ἀδυνατήσῃ τοῦ ἐπαρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως οὐκ ἐν τῇ αἰτίᾳ ταύτῃ συζητημένων — Syn Const. Can. 6.

course of people were advanced in reputation and interest) assuming such authority to themselves; and the lesser Bishops easily complying; And of this we have some Arguments. Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem being deposed and extruded by Acacius, Metropolitan of Palestine, did ap-

Theod. 2.  
26.  
Soz. 4.25.

Βιζάντιον ἢ καθολικὴν διαμνησάμενος  
μὴδ' ὀππότε δὴ κατέλειπε — τὸ  
μὴδ' ὅν μὴδ' ἢ παρὰ τὸν Θεὸν τῶν συ-  
νοδικῶν Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ ἐν Κωνσταντι-  
νουπόλει — Soz. 2.40.

peal to a greater Judicatory, being the first, (as Socrates noteth) who ever did use that course; because, it seemeth, there was no greater in being till about that time; which was some years before the Synod of Constantinople; in which there is mention of a greater Synod of the Diocese —

There was a convention of Bishops of the Pontick Diocese at Tyana; (distinguished from the Asian Bishops) whereof Eusebius of Cesarea is reckoned in the first place, as President; in the time of Valens.

Τῶν δὲ Νεκταρίου· ὡς ἱεροῦ  
ἱεροῦ ἡγεμονίας ἡγετο. (in prophanatico ad  
Imper.)

Τὸν δὲ Νεκταρίον Ἐπισκόπον —  
Can. 2.

Περὶ τῶν μὴδ' ὅν τῶν τῆς Διο-  
κείας Ἐπισκόπων — Can. 6.

Nectarius Bishop of Constantinople is said by the Synod of Chalcedon to have presided in the Synod of Constantinople.

A good Argument is drawn from the very Canon of the Synod of Constantinople it self; which doth speak concerning Bishops over Dio-

ceses as already constituted, or extant; not instituting that Order of Bishops, but supposing it, and together with an implicit confirmation regulating practice according to it, by prohibiting Bishops to leap over the bounds of their Diocese, so as to meddle in the affairs of other Dioceses; and by ordering appeals to the Synod of a Diocese.

Of Authority gained by such assumption, and concession without law, there might be produced divers instances.

As particularly that the See of Constantinople did assume to it self Ordination and other acts of Jurisdiction, in three Dioceses, before any such power was granted to it by any Synodical Decree; the which to have

Syn. Chalc. A.D. 16. (p. 463)

Ἰωάννης δὲ κατέστη Ἐπίσκοπος καθέλει, ἀπολύνει ἐν Ἀσίᾳ, καὶ ἐν ἑσπερίᾳ ἀλ-  
λως αὐτὸν αὐτῶν. Syn. Chalc. A.D. 11.  
(p. 411.)

done divers instances shew; some whereof are alledged in the Synod of Chalcedon; as St. Chrysostom, of whom it is there said, That going into Asia he deposed fifteen Bishops, and consecrated others in their room.

Soz. 8.6. He also deposed Gerontius Bishop of Nicomedia, belonging to the Diocese of Pontus.

Τὸ δὲ ἐν πολλῇ κερταύῃ ἐστὶν ὅτι ἔχον  
ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἀγία Θεὸς Ἐκκλησία  
εἰς τὸ χειροτονεῖν μητροπολίτας τῶν Διοκείων  
τῆς τε Ἀσιατικῆς, καὶ Ποντικῆς, καὶ Θρακικῆς καὶ  
ἡμετέρας (ἡμετέρας) ἐκκλησιαστικῆς. Syn.  
Chalc. in Epist. ad P. Leonem.

Whence the Fathers of Chalcedon did aver, That they had in a Synod confirmed the ancient custom which the Holy Church of God in Constantinople had, to ordain Metropolitans in the Asian, Pontic, and Thracian Dioceses.

The which custom, (consistent with reason, and becoming the dignity of the Empire, and grateful to the Court) that great Synod did establish, although the Roman Church out of jealousy did contest and protest against it.

Syn. Chalc.  
A.D. 16.  
(p. 462-)

But the most pertinent instances are those of the Roman, Alexandrine, and Antiochene Churches, having by degrees assumed to themselves such power over divers Provinces; in imitation of which Churches the other Diocesan Bishops may well be thought to have enlarged their Jurisdiction.

This

This form of government is intimated in the Synod of *Ephesus*; by those words in which Dioceses and Provinces are distinguished; and the same shall be observed in all Dioceses and all Provinces every where.

However that this form of Discipline was perfectly settled in the times of the Fourth General Synod is evident by two notable Canons thereof, wherein it is decreed, that if any Bishop have a controversy with his Metropolitan of his Province, he shall resort to and be judged by the Exarch of the Diocese, or by the See of Constantinople.

This was a great privilege conferred on the Bishop of Constantinople; the which perhaps did ground (to be sure it did make way for) the plea of that Bishop to the Title of *Oecumenical Patriarch*, or *Universal Bishop*, which Pope Gregory did so exagitate; and indeed it foundeth so fairly toward it, that the Pope hath nothing comparable to it to alledge in favour of his pretences; this being the Decree of the greatest Synod that ever was held among the Ancients, where all the Patriarchs did concur in making these Decrees; which Pope Gregory did reverence as one of the Gospels. — If any ancient Synod did ever constitute any thing like to *Universal Monarchy*, it was this; wherein a final determination of greatest Causes was granted to the See of Constantinople, without any exception or reservation: I mean as to semblance, and the sound of words; for as to the true sense I do indeed conceive that the Canon did only relate to causes emergent in the Eastern parts; and probably it did only respect the three Dioceses (of *Asia*, *Pontus*, and *Thrace*) which were immediately subjected to his Patriarchal Jurisdiction.

Pope Nicholas I. doth very jocularly expound this Canon; affirming that by the Primacy of the Diocese is understood the Pope (Diocese being put by a notable figure for Dioceses) and that an appeal is to be made to the Bishop of Constantinople, only by permission, in case the party will be content therewith.

*postoli primi V carium, nullus penitus intelligitur* — None can understand whom the Holy Synod should call Primacy of a Diocese, except the Vicar of the prime Apostle.

*Tantum valet dixisse Primatem Dioceseos, quantum si perhibuisset Dioceseon.* P. Nich. I. Ep. 8. (p. 507.) To say the Primacy of a Diocese is as much as to say of Dioceses.

We may note, that some Provincial Churches were by ancient custom exempted from dependence on any Primacy or Patriarchate.

Such an one the *Cyprian* Church was adjudged to be in the *Ephesine* Synod; wherein the privileges of such Churches were confirmed against the invasion of greater Churches; and to that purpose this general Law enacted, Let the same be observed in all Dioceses and Provinces every where — that none of the Bishops most beloved of God invade another Province which did not formerly belong to him or his Predecessors; and if any one have invaded one, and violently seiz'd it, that he restore it.

Such a Church was that of *Britain* anciently, before *Austin* did introduce the Papal Authority here, against that Canon: as by divers learned Pens hath been shewed.

Such was the Church of *Africk*, as by their Canons against transmarine appeals, and about all other matters doth appear.

Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν ἐπαρχικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. Syn. Eph. Can. 8.

[There is mention of Dioceses in Strabo.]

Εἰ δὲ τις ἐκ τῶν αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας Μητροπολίτων Ἐπισκοπῶν ἢ κληρικῶν ἀμφισβητήσῃ, καταλαμβάνειν ἢ ἐξαρχῶν τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τῆς βασιλευσῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως δρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῇ δικάζειν. Syn. Chalc. Can. 19, § 17.

Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν ἐπαρχικῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. — ὥστε μηδὲν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡγῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας καταλαμβάνειν, διὰ τὴν καὶ πρὸς καταλάβαν, καὶ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν πιπνίσται, βίαια μὲν τὸν ἀποδιδόναι, &c. Conc. Eph. Can. 8.



16id. dist. 2.  
cap. 1.

It is supposed, by some, that Discipline was screwed yet one peg higher, by setting up the Order of *Patriarchs* higher than *Primates*, or *Diocesan Exarchs*; but I find no ground of this supposal except in one case; that is, of the Bishop of *Constantinople* being set above the Bishops of *Ephesus*, *Cæsarea* and *Heraclea*, which were the *Primates* of the three *Dioceses*.

*Omnes five Patriarchæ cuiuslibet apices, five Metropolitani Primatus, aut Episcopatum Cathedras, vel Ecclesiarum cuiuslibet Ordinis Dignitates instituit Romana Ecclesia, P. Nic. II. Dist. 22. cap. 1.*

It is a notable Fib which Pope *Nicholas II.* telleth, as *Gratian* citeth him; That the Church of *Rome* instituted all *Patriarchal Supremacies*, all *Metropolitan Primacies*, *Episcopal Sees*, all *Ecclesiastical Orders and Dignities whatsoever*.

Now things standing thus in Christendom, we may, concerning the interest of the *Roman* Bishop, in reference to them, observe,

1. In all these transactions about modelling the spiritual Discipline, there was no Canon established any peculiar Jurisdiction to the Bishop of *Rome*, only the

2. Synod of *Nice* did suppose that he by custom did enjoy some Authority within certain precincts of the West, like to that which it did confirm to the Bishop of *Alexandria* in *Egypt*, and the Countries adjacent thereto.

Περὶ τῆς τιμῆς. Can. 3.  
Τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ ἑξῆς τῆς τιμῆς. Syn.  
Ch. Aft. 16.

3. The Synods of *Constantinople* did allow him honorary privileges or precedence before all other Bishops, assigning the next place after him to the Bishop of *Constantinople*.

Ἡ πρώτη τιμή.  
ἀρχαῖα.

4. In other privileges the Synod of *Chalcedon* did equal the See of *Constantinople* to the *Roman*.

5. The Canons of the two First and Fourth General Synods, ordering all affairs to be dispatched, and causes to be determined in *Metropolitan* or *Diocesan* Synods, do exclude the *Roman* Bishop from meddling in those concerns.

6. The Popes (out of a humour natural to them, to like nothing but what they did themselves, and which served their Interests) did not relish those Canons, although enacted by Synods which themselves admitted for Oecumenical: That subscription of some

*Persuasioni enim tuæ in nullo penitus suffragatur quorundam Episcoporum ante sexaginta, ut jactas, annos facta subscriptio, nunquam; à prædecessoribus tuis ad Apostolicæ Sedis transmissa notitiam, cui ab initio sui caduce, dudumque collapsa sera nunc & inutilia subicere fomenta voluisti — P. Leo. Ep. 53. (ad Anatol.) Vid. Ep. 54, & 55, & 61.*

*Romana autem Ecclesia ejusdem Canonis vel gesta Synodi illius hæcenus non habet, nec accepit. Greg. M. Ep. 6. 31. (ad Eulog. Alex.)*

Bishops made above sixty years since as you boast, does no whit favour your persuasion; a subscription never transmitted to the knowledge of the Apostolick See by your Predecessors, which from its very beginning being weak, and long since ruinous, you endeavour now too late and unprofitably to revive.

So doth Pope *Leo I.* treat the Second Great Synod, writing to *Anatolius*: and *Gregory* speaking of the same says, That the *Roman Church* has not the acts of that Synod, nor received its Canons.

7. Wherefore in the West they did obtain no effect, so as to establish *Diocesan Primacies* there.

N A Roman Synod, Anno 378 consisting of Italian Bishops did

The Bishops of Cities, which were Heads of *Dioceses*, either did not know of these Canons (which is probable, because *Rome* did smother the notice of them:) or were hindered from using them; the Pope having so winded himself in, and got such hold among them, as he would not let go.

give the Pope such a privilege as the Synod of *Constantinople* did to the Bishop of that See. (*Marc. de Primat. p. 103. ex app. Cod. Theodol. Vide Baron.*)

But there is difference between a General Synod, and an Italian Synod: and what had an Italian Synod to prescribe to all the Provinces of the Roman Empire, or rather of the West? *P. Greg. I. Ep. 7. 8.*

8. It indeed turned to a great advantage of the Pope, in carrying on his Encroachments, and enlarging his worldly Interests, that the Western Churches did not, as the Eastern, conform themselves to the Political frame in embracing *Diocesan* Primacies; which would have engaged and enabled them better to protect the Liberties of their Churches from Papal Invasions.

*Basilius*  
thinketh,  
that *Hila-*  
*rius* of  
*Arles* did

pretend and offer at his Primatical power *apud* Marc. 5. 32. but P. Leo did mainly check and quash his attempt.

9. For hence, for want of a better, the Pope did claim to himself a Patriarchal authority over the Western Churches; pretending a right of calling Synods, of meddling in Ordinations, of determining Causes by appeal to him; of dictating Laws and Rules to them, against the old rights of Metropolitans, and the later Constitutions for Primacies.

Of this we have an Instance in St. Gregory; where he alledging an Imperial Constitution importing that in case a Clergy-man should appeal from his Metropolitan, *the cause should be referred to the Archbishop and Patriarch of that Diocese, who judging according to the Canons and Laws should give an end thereto*; doth consequentially assume an appeal from a Bishop to himself, adjoining, *If against these things it be said, that the Bishop had neither Metropolitan nor Patriarch, it is to be said that this cause was to be heard and decided by the Apostolical See, which is the head of all Churches.*

*Contra hæc si dictum fuerit, quia nec Metropolitanam habuit nec Patriarcham; dicendum est quia à Sede Apostolica, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum caput est, causa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat. Greg. I. Ep. 11. 56.*

10. Having got such advantage, and as to extent stretched his Authority beyond the bounds of his *sub-urbicarian precincts*, he did also intend it in quality far beyond the privileges by any Ecclesiastical Law granted to Patriarchs; or claimed or exercised by another Patriarch; till at length by degrees he had advanced it to an exorbitant omnipotency, and thereby utterly enslaved the Western Churches.

*Ruffin.*  
*Hist. 1. 6.*

The ancient Order did allow a Patriarch or Pimate to call a Synod of the Bishops in his Diocese, and with them to determine Ecclesiastical Affairs by majority of Suffrages; but he doth not do so, but setting himself down in his Chair, with a few of his Courtiers about him, doth make Decrees and Dictates, to which he pretendeth all must submit.

The ancient Order did allow a Patriarch to ordain Metropolitans duly elected in their Dioceses; leaving Bishops to be ordained by the Metropolitans in their Provincial Synods; but he will meddle in the Ordination of every Bishop, suffering none to be constituted without his confirmation, for which he must soundly pay.

The ancient Order did allow a Patriarch, with the advice and consent of his Synod, to make Canons for the well-ordering his Diocese; but he sendeth about his Decretal Letters, composed by an infallible Secretary, which he pretendeth must have the force of Laws, equal to the highest Decrees of the whole Church.

The ancient Order did suppose Bishops by their Ordination sufficiently obliged to render unto their Patriarch due observance, according to the Canons, he being liable to be judged in a Synod for the transgression of his duty; but he forceth all Bishops to take the most slavish oaths of obedience to him that can be imagined.

The ancient Order did appoint that Bishops accused for offences should be judged in their Provinces; or upon appeal from them in Patriarchal Synods:

Synods: but he receiveth appeals at the first hand, and determineth them in his Court, without calling such a Synod in an age for any such purpose.

The ancient Patriarchs did order all things, as became good Subjects, with leave and under submission to the Emperour, who as he pleased did interpose his confirmation of their Sanctions: but this man pretendeth to decree what he pleaseth without the leave, and against the will of Princes.

Wherefore he is not a Patriarch of the Western Churches, (for that he acteth according to no Patriarchal Rule) but a certain kind of Sovereign Lord, or a tyrannical Oppressor of them:

Idem. in  
dist. 21.  
cap. 1.

11. In all the transactions for modelling the Church there never was allowed to the Pope any dominion over his Fellow-patriarchs, or of those great Primates who had assumed that name to themselves; among whom indeed, for the dignity of his City, he had obtained a priority of honour or place; but never had any power over them settled by a title of Law, or by clear and uncontested practice.

Infomuch, that if any of them had erred in Faith, or offended in Practice, it was requisite to call a General Synod to judge them; as in the cases of *Athanasius*, of *Gregory Nazianzene* and *Maximus*, of *Theophilus* and *St. Chrysostom*, of *Nestorius* and of *Dioscorus*—— is evident.

12. Indeed all the *Oriental Churches* did keep themselves pretty free from his encroachments, although, when he had swollen so big in the West, he sometimes did take occasion to attempt on their Liberty; which they sometimes did warily decline, sometimes stoutly did oppose.

V. d. de  
Marc. lib. 7.  
cap. 4. & 5.

But as to the main, those flourishing Churches constantly did maintain a distinct administration from the Western Churches, under their own Patriarchs and Synods, not suffering him to interlope in prejudice to their Liberty.

They, without his leave or notice, did call and celebrate Synods (whereof all the first great Synods are instances) there Ordinations were not confirmed or touched by him; Appeals were not (with publick regard or allowance) thence made to him in causes great or little, but they decided them among themselves: they quashed Heresies springing up among them, as the Second General Synod, the *Macedonians*, *Theophilus* the *Origenists*, &c. Little in any case had his Worship to do with them, or they with him, beyond what was needful to maintain general communion and correspondence with him; which they commonly, as piety obliged, were willing to do.

And sometimes, when a pert Pope, upon some incidental advantage of differences risen among them, would be more busy than they deemed convenient in tampering with their affairs they did rap his fingers: so *Victor*, so *Stephanus*, so *Julius* and *Liberius* of old did feel to their smart: so afterwards *Damasus* and other Popes in the case of *Flavianus*; *Innocent* in the case of *St. Chrysostom*; *Felix* and his Successors in the case of *Aca-cius* did find little regard had to their interposals.

So things proceeded, till at length a final rupture was made between them, and they would not suffer him at all to meddle with their affairs.

Before I proceed any farther, I shall briefly draw some Corollaries from this Historical account which I have given of the original and growth of *Metropolitan*, *Primatical*, and *Patriarchal* Jurisdiction.

1. Patriarchs are an humane Institution.

2. As



2. As they were erected by the power and prudence of men, so they may be dissolved by the same.

3. They were erected by the leave and confirmation of Princes; and by the same they may be dejected, if great reason do appear.

4. The Patriarchate of the Pope beyond his own Province or Diocese doth not subsist upon any Canon of a General Synod.

5. He can therefore claim no such power otherwise than upon his invasion or assumption.

6. The Primates and Metropolitans of the Western Church cannot be supposed otherwise than by force, or out of fear, to have submitted to such an authority as he doth usurp.

7. It is not really a Patriarchal Power (like to that which was granted by the Canons and Princes) but another sort of power which the Pope doth exercise.

6. The most rightful Patriarch, holding false Doctrine, or imposing unjust Laws, or tyrannically abusing his power, may and ought to be rejected from communion.

9. Such a Patriarch is to be judged by a free Synod, if it may be had.

10. If such a Synod cannot be had by consent of Princes, each Church may free it self from the mischiefs induced by his perverse doctrine or practice.

11. No Ecclesiastical Power can interpose in the management of any affairs within the Territory of any Prince without his concession.

12. By the Laws of God, and according to ancient Practice, Princes may model the bounds of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, erect Bishopricks, enlarge, diminish, or transfer them as they please.

13. Wherefore each Prince (having Supreme Power in his own Dominions, and equal to what the Emperor had in his) may exclude any foreign Prelate from Jurisdiction in his Territories.

14. It is expedient for peace and publick Good that he should do thus.

15. Such Prelate, according to the rules of Christianity, ought to be content with his doing so.

16. Any Prelate, exercising Power in the Dominion of any Prince *ecclesiasticus*, his Subject; as the Popes and all Bishops were to the *Roman* Emperors.

17. Those joints of Ecclesiastical Discipline, established in the *Roman* Empire by the confirmation of Emperors, were (as to necessary continuance) dissolved by the dissolution of the *Roman* Empire.

18. The power of the Pope in the Territories of any Prince did subsist by his authority and favour.

19. By the same reason as Princes have curbed the exorbitancy of Papal power in some cases (of entertaining Legates, making appeals, disposing of Benefices, &c.) by the same they might exclude it.

20. The practice of Christianity doth not depend upon the subsistence of such a form instituted by man.

Having shewed at large that this Universal Sovereignty and Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome* over the Christian Church hath no real Foundation either in Scripture or elsewhere, it will be requisite to shew by what ways and means so groundless, a claim and pretence should gain belief and submission to it from so considerable a part of Christendom; and that from so very slender roots (from slight beginnings and the slimmest pretences one can well imagine) this bulk of exorbitant power did grow, the vastest that ever man on earth did attain, or did ever aim at, will be less wonderful, if we do consider the many causes which did concur and contribute thereto; some whereof are proposed in the following Observations.

1. Eminency of any kind (in wealth, in honour, in reputation, in might, in place, or mere order of dignity,) doth easily pass into advantages of  
real

*De pusilla  
crescere.  
P. Leo.  
Ep. 55.*

real power and command over those who are inferior in those respects, and have any dealings or common transactions with such Superiors.

For to persons endowed with such eminency by voluntary deference the conduct of affairs is wont to be allowed; none presuming to stand in competition with them, every one rather yielding place to them than to their equals.

The same conduct of things, upon the same accounts, and by reason of their possession, doth continue fast in their hands, so long as they do retain such advantages.

Then from a custom of managing things doth spring up an opinion or a pretence of right thereto; they are apt to assume a title, and others ready to allow it.

Men naturally do admire such things, and so are apt to defer extraordinary respect to the possessors of them.

Advantages of wealth and might are not only instruments to attain, but incentives spurring men to affect the getting authority over their poorer and weaker neighbours: for men will not be content with bare eminency, but will desire real power and sway, so as to obtain their wills over others, and not to be crossed by any. Pope Leo had no reason to wonder that *Anatolius* Bishop of *Constantinople* was not content with dry honour. Men are apt to think their honour is precarious and standeth on an uncertain foundation, if it be not supported with real power; and therefore they will not be satisfied to let their advantages lie dead, which are so easily improvable by power, by inveigling some, and scaring or constraining others to bear their yoke: and they are able to benefit and gratify some, and thereby render them willing to submit, those afterwards become serviceable to bring others under, who are disaffected or refractory.

So the Bishops of *Constantinople* and of *Jerusalem*, at first had only privileges of honour; but afterward they soon hooked in power.

Now the *Roman* Bishops from the beginning were eminent above all other Bishops, in all kinds of advantages.

Euseb. 6. 43. (Anno 254.)

Oblationibus macro- } Amm. Marc.  
narum ditati. } l. 27. (p. 337.)  
Circumspecte vestiti. } Anno 367.

Euseb.

the greatest income (from liberal oblations) to dispose of. He lived in greatest state and lustre. He had opportunities to assist others in their business, and to relieve them in their wants. He necessarily thence did obtain great respect and veneration. Hence in all common affairs, the conduct and presidency were naturally devolved on him, without contest.

No wonder then, that after some time the Pope did arrive to some pitch of authority over poor Christians, especially those who lay nearest to him; improving his eminency into power, and his pastoral charge into a kind of

Empire; according to that observation of *Socrates*, that long before his time the Roman Episcopacy had advanced it self beyond the Priesthood into a Potentacy.

Τὴν Παύλου Ἐπισκοπὴν μέγα τὴν ἰσχυρίαν ἐπὶ διωκταῖς ἡδὲ πάσαις ἀνελύσσουσιν. Socr. 7. 11.

Socr. 7. 7.

And the like he observeth, to have happen'd in the Church of *Alexandria*, upon the like grounds, or by imitation of such a pattern.

2. Any small power is apt to grow and spread it self; a spark of it soon will expand it self into a flame: it is very like to the grain of mustard seed, which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among

Τὸ σμικρὸν σπέρμα τὸ διωκταῖς, ἡ ἀνελύσσουσα. Plut. in Pyrrh.

herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. Encroaching (as *Plutarch* saith) is an innate disease of Potentacies.

Whoever hath any pittance of it, will be improving his stock, having tasted

tasted the sweetness of having his will which extremely gratifieth the nature of man) he will not be satisfied without having more; he will take himself to be straitned by any bounds; and will strive to free himself of all restraints.

Any pretence will serve to ground attempts of enlarging power, and none will be balked. For Power is bold, enterprising, restless: it always watcheth, or often findeth, never passeth opportunities of dilating it self. Every accession doth beget farther advantages to amplify it; as its stock groweth, so it with ease proportionably doth encrease; being ever out at use. As it groweth, so its strength to maintain and enlarge it self doth grow: it gaining more wealth, more friends, more associates and dependents.

*Subrepenti occasiones non pratermittit ambitio—* Ep. I. Ep. 62.  
*Facilius crescit dignitas quam incipit.* Sen. Ep. 101.  
*Prima dominandi spes in arduo; ubi sit ingressus, adsunt studia & ministri.* Tacit. Ann. 4. (p. 143.)

None can resist or obstruct its growth without danger and manifold disadvantages; for as its adherents are deemed loyal and faithful, so its opposers are branded with the imputations of rebellion, contumacy, disloyalty; and not succeeding in their resistance they will be undone.

None ever doth enterprize more than to stop its carriere; so that it seldom loseth by opposition; and it ever gaineth by composition. If it be checked at one time, or in one place, it will, like the Sea, at another season, in another point, break in. If it is sometimes overthrown in a Battle, it is seldom conquered in the War.

It is always on its march forward, and gaineth ground; for one encroachment doth countenance the next, and is alledged for a precedent to authorize or justify it. It seldom moveth backward; for every Successor thinketh he may justly enjoy what his Predecessor did gain, or which is transmitted into his possession; so that there hardly can ever be any restitution of ill-gotten-power.

Thus have many absolute Kingdoms grown; the first Chief was a Leader of Volunteers; from thence he grew to be a Prince with stated Privileges; after he became a Monarch invested with high Prerogatives; in fine, he creepeth forward to a *Grand Seignieur*, usurping absolute dominion; so did *Augustus Caesar* first only assume the style of Prince of the Senate, demeaning himself modestly as such; but he soon drew to himself the administration of all things; and upon that foundation his Successors very suddenly did erect a boundless power. If you trace the footsteps of most Empires to the beginning you may perceive the like.

So the Pope, when he had got a little power, continually did swell it. The puny pretence of the succeeding Saint Peter, and the name of the *Apostolical See*; the precedence by reason of the Imperial City; the honorary privileges allowed him by Councils; the Authority deferred to him by one Synod of revising the Causes of Bishops; the countenance given to him in repressing some Heresies, he did improve to constitute himself Sovereign Lord of the Church.

3. Spiritual power especially is of a growing nature, and more especially that which deriveth from Divine Institution; for it hath a great awe upon the hearts and consciences of men; which engageth them to a firm and constant adherence. It useth the most subtile arms, which it hath always ready, which needeth no time or cost to furnish, which cannot be extorted from its hand; so that it can never be disarmed. And its weapons make strong impression, because it proposeth the most effectual encouragements to its abettors, and discouragements to its adversaries; alluring the one with promises of God's favour and eternal happiness, terrifying the other with menaces of vengeance from heaven and endless misery;



misery; the which do ever quell religious, superstitious, weak people; and often daunt men of knowledge and courage.

It is presumed unchangeable and unextinguishable by any humane power, and thence is not (as all other power) subject to revolutions. Hence like *Achilles* it is hardly vincible, because almost immortal. If it be sometimes rebuffed or impaired; it soon will recover greater strength and vigour.

Dist. 21.  
cap. 2. 3.

The Popes derive their Authority from Divine Institution; and their weapons always are sentences of Scripture; they pretend to dispense remission of sins; and promise heaven to their abettors. They excommunicate, curse and damn the opposers of their designs.

*Privilegia Romanae Ecclesiae nullum  
possunt sustinere detrimentum* — P.  
Nic. I. Ep. 36. (32 —)

They pretend they never can lose any power that ever did belong to their See: they are always stiff, and they never recede or give back. *The privileges of the Roman Church can sustain no detriment.*

4. Power is easily attained and augmented upon occasion of dissensions. Each faction usually doth make it self a Head, the chief in strength and reputation which it can find inclinable to favour it; and that Head it will strive to magnify, that he may be the abler to promote its cause; and if the cause doth prosper he is rewarded with accession of Privileges and Authority: especially those who were oppressed, and find relief by his means, do become zealously active for his aggrandisement.

Thus usually in civil broils the Captain of the prevalent Party groweth a Prince, or is crowned with great Privileges (as *Cæsar*, *Octavian*, *Cromwell*, &c.)

So upon occasion of the *Arian* faction, and the oppression of *Athanasius*, *Marcellus*, *Paulus*, and other Bishops, the Pope (who by their application to him had occasion to head the Catholick Party did grow in power;) for thereupon the *Sardican* Synod did decree to him that Privilege, which he infinitely enhanced, and which became the main engin of rearing himself so high.

And by his interposal in the dissensions raised by the *Nestorians*, the *Pelagians*, the *Eutychians*, the *Acacians*, the *Monothelites*, the *Image-worshippers*, and *Image-breakers*, &c, his authority was advanced; for he, adhering in those causes to the prevailing Party, was by them extolled, obtaining both reputation and sway.

5. All power is attended by dependencies of persons sheltered under it, and by it enjoying subordinate advantages; the which proportionably do grow by its encrease.

Such persons therefore will ever be inciting their Chief and Patron to amplify his power; and in aiding him to compass it, they will be very industriously, resolutely and steadily active; their own interest moving them thereto.

Wherefore their mouths will ever be open in crying him up, their heads will be busy in contriving ways to further his interests, their care and pains will be employed in accomplishing his designs; they with their utmost strength will contend in his defence against all oppositions.

Thus the *Roman* Clergy first, then the Bishops of *Italy*, then all the Clergy of the *West* became engaged to support, to fortifie, to enlarge the *Papal* authority; they all sharing with him in domination over the Laity; and injoying wealth, credit, support, privileges and immunities thereby. Some of them especially were ever putting him on higher pretences, and furthering him by all means in his acquit and maintenance of them.

6. Hence if a Potentate himself should have no ambition, nor much ability to improve his power; yet it would of it self grow, he need only be passive therein; the interest of his partisans would effect it; so that often

often power doth no less thrive under sluggish and weak Potentates, especially if they are void of goodness, than under the most active and able: Let the Ministers alone to drive on their interest.

7. Even persons otherwise just and good do seldom scruple to augment their power by undue encroachment, or at least to uphold the usurpations of their foregoers; for even such are apt to favour their own pretences, and afraid of incurring censure and blame, if they should part with any thing left them by their Predecessors. They apprehend themselves to owe a dearth to their place, engaging them to tender its own weal and prosperity, in promoting which they suppose themselves not to act for their own private interest; and that it is not out of ambition or avarice, but out of a regard to the grandeur of their Office that they stickle and bustle; and that in so doing they imitate Saint Paul who did *magnify his office*. They are encouraged hereto by the applause of men, especially of those who are allied with them in interest, and who converse with them; who take it for a Maxime, *Boni Principis est ampliare imperium*: The extenders of Empire are admired and commended however they do it, although with cruel Wars, or by any unjust means.

Hence usually the worthiest men in the world's eye are greatest enlargers of power; and such men bringing appearances of virtue, ability, reputation to aid their endeavours, do most easily compass designs of this nature, finding less obstruction to their attempts; for men are not so apt to suspect their integrity, or to charge them with ambition and avarice; and the few, who discern their aims and consequences of things, are overborn by the number of those who are favourably conceited and inclined toward them.

Thus *Julius I. Damasus I. Innocent I. Gregory I.* and the like Popes, whom History representeth as laudable persons, did yet confer to the advancement of Papal grandeur. But they who did most advance that interest, as Pope *Leo I. Gelasius I. Pope Nicholas I. Pope Gregory VII.* in the esteem of true zealots pass for the best Popes. Hence the distinction between a good Man, a good Prince, a good Pope.

Sixtus V.

8. Men of an inferior condition are apt to express themselves highly in commendation of those who are in a superior rank, especially upon occasion of address and intercourse; which commendations are liable to be interpreted for acknowledgments or attestations of right, and thence do sometimes prove means of creating it.

Of the generality of men it is truly said, that it doth fondly serve fame, and is stonn'd with titles and images; readily ascribing to Superiors whatever they claim, without scanning the grounds of their title. Simple and weak men out of abjectness or fear are wont to crouch, and submit to any thing upon any terms. Wise men do not love brangling, nor will expose their quiet and safety without great reason; thence being inclinable to comply with greater persons. Bad men out of design to procure advantages or impunity are prone to flatter and gloze with them. Good men out of due reverence to them, and in hope of fair usage from them, are ready to complement them, or treat them with the most respectful terms. Those who are obliged to them will not spare to extol them; paying the easy return of good words for good deeds.

Thus all men conspire to exalt power; the which snatcheth all good words as true, and construeth them to the most favourable sense; and alledgeth them as verdicts and arguments of unquestionable right. So are the complements or terms of respect used by *Hierom, Austin, Theodoret,* and divers others toward Popes, drawn into an Argument for Papal Authority;

—qui fama servit ineptus.  
Ac stupet in titulis & imaginibus—  
Hor.

thority; whenas the actions of such Fathers, and their discourses upon other occasions do manifest their serious judgment to have been directly contrary to his pretences: wherefore the Emperor of *Constantinople* in

\* Κατὰ ῥητὰ τῶν ἁγίων.  
Μάριος, ὁποῖ, πρὸς τὸν ἁγίον ἐν ἐπιστολῇ  
τιμῇ τῶν πάντων, καὶ ἐκλαβὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πρε-  
σβυτέρων. Syn. Flor. Sess. 25. (p. 848.)

the *Florentine* Synod had good reason to decline such sayings \*for arguments, for if (saith he) any of the Saints doth in an Epistle honour the Pope, shall he take that as importing privileges.

9. Good men commonly (out of charitable simplicity, meekness, modesty and humility, love of peace, and averfness from contention) are apt to yield to the encroachments of those who any-wise do excel them; and when such men do yield, others are ready to follow their example. Bad men have little interest to resist, and no heart to stand for publick good; but rather like in presently, taking advantage by their compliance to drive a good market for themselves. Hence so many of all sorts in all times did comply with Popes, or did not obstruct them; suffering them without great obstacle to raise their power.

10. If in such cases a few wise men do apprehend the consequences of things, yet they can do little to prevent them. They seldom have the courage with sufficient zeal to baffle against encroachments; fearing to be overborn by its stream, to lose their labour, and vainly to suffer by it: If they offer at resistance, it is usually faint and moderate: whereas power doth act vigorously, and push it self forward with mighty violence; so that it is not only difficult to check it, but dangerous to oppose it.

Ita de vocabulorum occasionibus plurimum questionibus subornantur, sicut & de verborum in communionibus. Tertull. de Resur. Carn. 54.

Ambiguity of words (as it causeth many debates, so) yieldeth much advantage to the foundation and amplification of power: for whatever is said of it, will be interpreted in favour of it, and

will afford colour to its pretences. Words innocently or carelessly used are by interpretation extended to signify great matters, or what you please. For instance,

The word *Bishop* may import any kind of superintendency or inspection; hence Saint *Peter* came to be reckoned Bishop of *Rome*, because in virtue of his Apostolical Office he had inspection over that Church founded by him, and might exercise some Episcopal acts.

Καὶ ἡγε-  
σαι κεφα-  
λὴν. Can.  
Apost. 34.

The word *Head* doth signify any kind of eminency, the word *Prince* any priority, the word to *preside* any kind of superiority or preeminence; hence some Fathers attributing those names to Saint *Peter*, they are interpreted to have thought him Sovereign in power over the Apostles. And because some did give like terms to the Pope, they infer his Superiority in power over all Bishops; notwithstanding such Fathers did express a contrary judgment.

The word *Successor* may import any derivation of power; hence because Saint *Peter* is said to have founded the Church of *Rome*, and to have ordain'd the first Bishop there, the Pope is called his Successor.

The word *Authority* doth often import any kind of influence upon the opinions or actions of men (grounded upon eminence of place, worth, reputation, or any such advantage.) Hence because

Quia duobus Episcopis, quorum ea tem-  
pestate summa auctoritas erat, non illu-  
ferat. — Sulp. Sev. 2. 63.

Because he had not deluded the two Bishops who had the greatest authority in those times.

Non Mediocris auctoritatis Episcopus Carthag. Aug. Ep. 162.

The Bishop of Carthage was of no mean Authority.

—audimur auctoritate suadendi potius quam jubendi potestate. Tac. de Mor. Ger. (p. 640.)

the Pope of old sometimes was desired to interpose his authority, they will understand him to have had right to command or judge in such cases; although authority is sometimes opposed to command, as where *Liwy* saith, that *Evander* did hold those places by authority rather than by command; and *Tacitus* of the German Princes saith, They are heard rather according to their authority of persuading, than power of commanding.



commanding. The word Judge (saith *Canus*) is frequently used to signify no more than I do think or conceive; whereby he doth excuse divers Popes from having decreed a notable error (for *Alexander III.* says of them, that they judged that after a matrimony contracted, not consummated; another may be valid, that being dissolved.) Yet if the Pope is said to have judged so or so in any case, it is alledged for a certain argument of proper Jurisdiction.

11. There is a strange enchantment in words; which being (although with no great colour of reason) assumed, do work on the fancies of men, especially of the weaker sort. Of these power doth ever arrogate to it self such as are most operative, by their force sustaining and extending it self.

So divers prevalent Factions did assume to themselves the name of *Catholick*; and the *Roman* Church particularly hath appropriated that word to it self, even so as to commit a Bull, implying *Rome* and the Universe to be the same place; and the perpetual canting of this Term hath been one of its most effectual charms to weak people. *I am a Catholick*, that is, an *Universal*, therefore all I hold is true; this is their great argument.

The words *Successor of Peter*, *Apostolick See*, *Prima Sedes*, have been strongly urged for Arguments of Papal Authority; the which have beyond their true force (for indeed they signify nothing) had a strange efficacy upon men of understanding and wisdom.

12. The Pope's power was much amplified by the importunity of persons condemned or extruded from their places, whether upon just accounts, or wrongfully and by faction; for they finding no other more hopeful place of refuge and redress did often apply to him: for what will not men do, whither will not they go in straits?

Thus did *Marcion* go to *Rome*, and sue for admission to communion there. So *Fortunatus* and *Felicissimus* in *St. Cyprian*, being condemned in *Africk* did fly to *Rome* for shelter, of which absurdity *St. Cyprian* doth so complain. So likewise *Martianus* and *Basilides*, in *St. Cyprian*, being outed of their Sees, for having lapsed from the Christian profession, did fly to *Stephen* for succour, to be restored. So *Maximus* (the Cynick) went to *Rome*, to get a confirmation of his election at *Constantinople*. So *Marcellus*, being rejected for Heterodoxy, went thither to get attestation to his Orthodoxy (of which *St. Basil* complaineth.) So *Apollonius*, being condemned in *Africk* for his crimes, did appeal to *Rome*.

And on the other side, *Athanasius* being with great partiality condemned by the Synod of *Tyre*, *Paulus* and other Bishops being extruded from their Sees for Orthodoxy; *St. Chrysostom* being condemned, and expelled by *Theophilus* and his complices; *Flavianus* being deposed by *Dioscorus*, and the *Ephesine* Synod; *Theodoret* being condemned by the same, ---did cry out for help from *Rome*. *Chelidonius*, Bishop of *Resanon*, being deposed by *Hilarinus* of *Arles*, (for crimes) did fly to Pope *Leo*. *Ignatius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, being extruded from his See by *Photius*, did complain to the Pope.

13. All Princes are forward to heap honour on the Bishop of their Imperial City; it seeming a disgrace to themselves, that so near a relation be an inferior to any other: who is as it were their Spiritual Pastor, who is usually by their special favour advanced. The City it self and the Court will be restless in assisting him to climb.

*Evander* — ea autoritate magis quam imperio retinebat loca. Liv. 1.  
Verbum Judico frequenter in ea significatione usurpatur, ut idem sit quod sentio seu opinor. Can. loc. 6. cap. 3. (comp. lib. 6. 1.)

—ut ad Domini mei tanti Pontificis & piissimi Patris, omnium ad se confugientium tutissimi defensoris ac protectoris, &c. Rothaldi appell. (in P. Nich. I. Ep. 37. p. 563.)

—my Lord so great a Pontiff, and most pious a Father, the safe defender and protector of all those that flee unto him for succour.

Cyp. Ep. 68.

Ep. 53.

Calendion of Antiocb, Liber. cap. 18.  
P. Leo, Ep. 89.  
Marc. 5. 32.  
P. Nich. I. Ep. 38. (p. 564.)  
Rothaldus.

Thus

Cod. Lib.  
r. tit. 2.  
cap. 16.

Thus did the Bishop of *Constantinople* arise to that high pitch of honour, and to be Second Patriarch; who at first was a mean Suffragan to the Bishop of *Heraclea*; this by the Synods of *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon* is assigned for the reason of his advancement. And how ready the Emperors were to promote the dignity of that Bishop, we see by many of their Edicts to that purpose; as particularly that of *Leo*.

So, for the honour of their City, the Emperors usually did favour the Pope, assisting him in the furtherance of his designs, and extending his Privileges by their Edicts at home, and Letters to the Eastern Emperors, recommending their affairs.

So in the Synod of *Chalcedon* we have the Letters of *Valentinian*, together with those of *Placidia* and of *Eudoxia* the Empreſſes to *Theodosius*, in behalf of Pope *Leo*, for retractation of the *Ephesine* Synod; wherein they do expreſs themselves engaged to maintain the honour of

Ὅτις πρὸς τὴν ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν πόλιν  
πᾶσι, ὡς καὶ παλαιὰ ποτὶς ἐπαύρηται  
ἡμῶν, ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἑσθλὰς ἐργασίαις.  
Syn. Chal. (p. 27.)

the Roman See; Seeing that (saith *Placidia*, Mother of *Theodosius*) it becometh us in all Things to preserve the honour and dignity of this chief City, which is the Mistress of all others.

Qualiter  
(Impera-  
tores) eam  
diversis  
beneficiis

So Pope *Nicholas* confesseth, that the Emperors had extolled the Roman See with divers privileges, had enriched it with gifts, had enlarged it with benefits (or benefices,) &c.

extulerint, donis ditaverint, beneficiis ampliaverint, qualiter illam, &c. P. Nic. I. Ep. 8. (p. 513.)

Romanus tempore priſco

Pauper erat Præſul, Regali munere crevit, &c.

Gunth. Lig. lib. 6.

14. The Popes had the advantage of being ready at hand to suggest what they pleased to the Court, and thereby to procure his Edicts (directed or dictated by themselves) in their favour, for extending their power, or repressing any opposition made to their encroachments.

*Baronius* observeth that the Bishops of *Constantinople* did use this advantage for their ends; for thus he reflecteth on the Edict of the Em-

Hæc Leo, sed Acacii fastu tumens  
proculdubio verbis concepta, & sſoſu-  
perbia exarata. Baron. Ann. 473 §. 4.

peror *Leo* in favour of that See: These things *Leo*, but questionless conceived in the words of *Acacius*, swelling with pride.

Apud  
Marc. 5.  
22.

\* Bin. ad  
P. Hill.  
Ep. 11.  
(p. 576.)

And no less unquestionably did the Popes conceive words for the Emperor in countenance of their Authority.

Such was the Edict of *Valentinian* in favour of *Leo* against *Hilarius* Bishop of *Arles*,\* (in an unjust cause as *Binius* confesseth) who contested his Authority to undo what was done in a *Gallicane* Synod. And

Ex his intelligis, Lector, cum de rebus  
sacris Imperatores leges sanxerint, id  
ipſum admonitione ſſ. Præſulum requi-  
rentium eorum officium ex scriptis legi-  
bus statuiffe. Baron. An. 458. §. 4.

we may thank *Baronius* himself for this Observation, By this, Reader, thou understandest, that when the Emperours ordained Laws concerning Religion, they did it by transcribing and enacting the Laws of the Church upon the admonition of the Holy Bishops requiring them to do their duty. It was a notable Edict, which Pope *Hilarius* alledged, It was also decreed by the Laws of Christian Princes, that whatsoever the Bishop of the Apostolick See should upon examination

Christianorum quoque Principum le-  
ge decretum est, &c. P. Hilarius, Ep. 11.  
(p. 576.)

pronounce concerning Churches and their Governours, &c. should with reverence be received and strictly observed, &c.

Such Edicts by crafty suggestions being at opportunes time from easy and unwary Princes procured, did hold, not being easily reverſed: and the Power which the Pope once had obtained by them, he would

would never part with; fortifying it by higher pretences of Divine P.Nich.I. Ep. 36.  
immutable right.

The Emperor *Gratian*, having gotten the World under him, did Theod. 5.  
order the Churches to those who would communicate with Pope *Damasus*. This and the like countenances did bring credit and authority to the *Roman* See.

15. It is therefore no wonder, that Popes being seated in the *Metropolis* of the Western Empire (the head of all the *Roman* State) should find interest sufficient to make themselves by degrees what they would be; for they not only surpassing the Provincial Bishops in wealth and repute, but having power in Court, who dared to pull a feather with them, or to withstand their encroachments? What wise man would not rather bear much, than contest upon such disadvantages, and without probable grounds of success?

16. Princes who favoured them with such concessions, and abetted their undertakings, did not foresee what such increase of power in time would arise to; or suspect the prejudice thence done to Imperial Authority. They little thought that in virtue thereof Popes would check, and mate Princes; or would claim superiority over them; for the Popes at that time did behave and express themselves with modesty and respect to Emperors.

17. Power once rooted doth find seasons and favourable junctures for its growth; the which it will be intent to embrace.

The confusions of things, the eruptions of Barbarians, the straits of Emperors, the contentions of Princes, &c. did all turn to account for him; and in confusion of things he did snatch what he could to himself.

The declination and infirmity of the *Roman* Empire gave him opportunity to strengthen his interests, either by closing with it, so as to gain somewhat by its concession; or by opposing it, so as to head a Faction against it. As he often had opportunity to promote the designs of Emperors and Princes, so those did return to him encrease of Authority; so they trucked and bartered together. For when Princes were in straits, or did need assistance (from his reputation at home) to the furtherance of their designs, or support of their interest in *Italy*, they were content to honour him, and grant what he desired: as in the case of *Acacius*, which had caused so long a Breach, the Emperor to engage Pope *Hormisdas*, did consent to his will. And at the *Florentine* Synod, the Emperor did bow to the Pope's terms, in hopes to get his assistance against the Turks.

When the *Eastern* Emperors, by his means chiefly, were driven out of *Italy*, he snatched a good part of it to himself, and set up for a Temporal Prince.

*Δενδρὸν ὡς ὅταν πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἐκλήβηται*  
When the Oak is fallen every one gets  
some wood.

When Princes did clash, he by yielding countenance to one side, would be sure to make a good market for himself: for this pretended Successor to the Fisherman, was really skilled to angle in troubled Waters.

They have been the incendiaries of Christendom, the kindlers and fomenters of War. And would often stir up Wars, and inclining to the stronger part, would share with the Conqueror; as when he stir'd up Anast. in Vir. Zach. P.Nich.I. Ep. 25. 30. &c.



*Non sine suspitione, quod illorum temporum Pontifices, qui bella extinguere, discordias tollere debuissent, suscitarent ea potius atq; nutrent.* up Charles against the Lombards. They would, upon spiritual pretence, be interpoling in all affairs.

*Modruviciensis Episc. in Conc. Lat. sub Leone X. Sess. 6. (p. 72.)*

He did oblige Princes by abetting their Cause when it was unjust or weak; his spiritual Authority satisfying their Conscience: whence he was sure to receive good acknowledgment and recompence. As  
An. 752. when he did allow Pepin's usurpation.

He pretended to dispose of Kingdoms, and to constitute Princes; reserving obeisance to himself. Gregory VII. granted to Robert Guiscard  
An. 1060. Naples and Sicily *beneficario jure*. Innocent II. gave to Roger the title of King.

There is scarce any Kingdom in Europe which he hath not claimed the Sovereignty of, by some pretence or other. Princes sometime for quiet sake have desired the Pope's consent and allowance of things appertaining of right to themselves, whence the Pope took advantage to claim an original right of disposing such things.

The proceeding of the Pope upon occasion of Wars is remarkable; when he did enter League with a Prince to side with him in a War against another, he did covenant to prosecute the Enemy with Spiritual Arms (that is, with Excommunications and Interdicts) engaging his Confederates to use Temporal Arms. So making Ecclesiastical Censures tools of Interest.

When Princes were in difficulties, (by the mutinous disposition of Princes, the emulation of Antagonists) he would, as served his interest interpose; hooking in some advantage to himself.

In the tumults against our King John, he struck in, and would have drawn the Kingdom to himself.

He would watch opportunity to quarrel with Princes, upon pretence they did intrench on his Spiritual Power: as about the point of the investiture of Bishops, and receiving homage from them.

Gregory VII. did excommunicate Henry III. (Anno 1076.)

Calixtus II. ————— Henry IV. (Anno 1120.)

Adrian IV. ————— Frederick, (Anno 1160.)

Celestinus III. ————— Henry V. (Anno 1195.)

Innocent III. ————— Otho (Anno 1219.)

Honorius III. and Gregory IX. — } Frederick II. (Anno 1220.)

Innocent IV. in the Ludg. Conc. } 1245.)

18. The ignorance of times did him great service; for then all the little Learning which was, being in his Clients and Factors, they could instill what they pleased into the credulous People. Then his Dictates would pass for infallible Oracles, and his Decrees for inviolable Laws: whence his veneration was exceedingly increased.

Anselme Anno 1109. } Eadmer.  
Becket Anno 1154 } Matt. Par.

19. He was forward to support factious Church-men against Princes, upon pretence of spiritual Interest and Liberty. And usually by his importunity and arts getting the better in such contests, he thereby did much strengthen his Authority.

20. He

20. He maketh himself the head of all the Clergy, and carrying himself as its Protector and Patron, did ingage thereby innumerable most able Heads, Tongues and Pens; who were devoted to maintain whatever he did, and had little else to do.

21. So great a party he cherished with exorbitant Liberties, suffering none to rule over them or touch them beside himself.

22. He did found divers *Militias* and bands of spiritual *Janisaries*, to be Combatants for his Interests; who depending immediately upon him, subsisting by his Charters, enjoying exemptions by his Authority from other Jurisdictions, being sworn to a special obeisance of him, were entirely at his devotion, ready with all their might to advance his Interests, and to maintain all the pretences of their Patron and Benefactor.

These had great sway among the People, upon account of their religious guises and pretences to extraordinary heights of sanctimony, austerity, contempt of the World. And learning being mostly confined to them, they were the chief Teachers and Guides of Christendom; so that no wonder, if he did challenge and could maintain any thing by their influence.

They did cry up his Power as superiour to all others. They did attribute to him titles strangely high, *Vice-god, Spouse of the Church, &c.* strange attributes of *Omnipotency, Infallibility, &c.*

23. Whereas Wealth is a great sinew of Power, he did invent divers ways of drawing great store thereof to himself.

*Pro pallio omnino aliquid dare prohibeo*  
Greg. I. Ep. 4. 44.

By how many tricks did he proll Money from all parts of Christendom? as by

Dispensations for Marriage within degrees prohibited, or at uncanonical times,--- for Vows and Oaths; for observance of Fasts and Abstinences; for Pluralities and incompatible Benefices, Non-residences, &c.

Indulgences, and Pardons, and freeing Souls from the pains of Purgatory.

Reservations, and Provisions of Benefices, not bestowed *gratis*.

Consecrated Presents; *Agnus Dei's, Swords, Roses, &c.*

Confirmations of Bishops; \* sending Palls.

*Vendit  
plumbum  
pro auro  
Taxa Ca-  
merariae*

\* In the

times of Henry I. the Bishop of York did pay 10000 l. Sterling for his Pall. *Mart. Par. (p. 274.)*

Appeals to his Court.

Tributes of *Peter-pence, Annates, Tithes*,--- introduced upon occasion of Holy Wars, and continued.

Playing fast and loose, tying knots, and undoing them for gain.

Sending Legates to drein places of Money.

Commutations of Penance for Money.

Inviting to Pilgrimage at *Rome*.

*Peter-  
pence.  
Plat. p.  
257.*

Hooking in Legacies. What a mass of Treasure did all this come to? what a Trade did he drive?

*Quantas nobis divitias peperit hæc fabula Christi?*

24. He did indeed easily by the help of his mercenary Divines transform most Points of Divinity in accommodation to his interests of Power, Reputation and Gain.

25. Any pretence, how slender soever, will in time get some validity; being fortified by the consent of divers Authors, and a current of sutable practice.

Any story serving the designs of a Party, will get credit by being often told, especially by Writers bearing a semblance of gravity; whereof divers will never be wanting to abet a flourishing Party.

26. The Histories of some Ages were composed only by the Popes Clients, *Friars and Monks*, and such People; which therefore are partial to him, addicted to his Interests, and under awe of him.

For a long time none dared open his mouth to question any of his pretences, or reprehend his practices, without being called *Heretick*, and treated as such.

27. Whereas the Pope had two sorts of Opposites to subdue, temporal *Princes* and *Bishops*; his business being to o'ertop *Princes*, and to enslave all *Bishops*; or to invade and usurp the rights of both; he used the help of each to compass his designs on the other; by the Authority of *Princes* oppressing *Bishops*, and by the assistance of *Bishops* mating *Princes*.

*Quando & Apostolica preceptio ad injuriam B. Petri in illis partibus non observatur, & à te spernitur & violatur.*

28. When any body would not do as he would have them, he did incessantly clamour or whine, that *Saint Peter* was injured.

*P. Nich. I. Ep. 37.*

29. The forgery of the *Decretal Epistles* (wherein the ancient Popes are made expressly to speak and act according to some of his highest pretences, devised long after their times, and which they never thought of, good men) did hugely conduce to his purpose; authorising his Encroachments by the suffrage of ancient Doctrine and Practice: a great part of his *Canon-law* is extracted out of these, and grounded on them.

The Donation of *Constantine*, fictitious Acts of Councils, and the like counterfeit stuff did help thereto; the which were soon embraced, as we see in Pope *Gregory II.* —

*Andm & d. 1. 2.*

*2. Inc. 2.*

*1. wild. p.*

*17.*

*Non neces-*

*fitatis, sed*

*honoris*

*causa peto.*

*Extorris*

*assentatio-*

*nibus. P.*

*Leo Epist.*

*(ad Syn.*

*Chalc)*

As also *Legends*, Fables of Miracles, and all such *deceivableness of unrighteousness*.

30. Popes were so cunning as to form Grants, and impute that to Privileges derived from them, which *Princes* did enjoy by right or custom.

31. Synods of *Bishops* called by him at opportune seasons, consisting of his *Votaries* or *Slaves*. None dared therein to whisper any thing to the prejudice of his Authority. He carried whatever he pleased to propose, without check or contradiction. Who dared to question any thing done by such numbers of *Pastors* styling themselves the *Representative of Christendom*.

32. The having hampered all the Clergy with strict Oaths of universal obedience to him (beginning about the times of Pope *Gregory VII.*) did greatly assure his Power.

33. When intolerable Oppressions and Exactions did constrain *Princes* to struggle with him, if he could not utterly prevail, things were brought to composition; whereby he was to be sure for that time a gainer, and gained establishment in some Points, leaving the rest to be got afterward in more favourable junctures.

Witness the { *Henry II. and P. Alex. III. Anno 1172.*

*Concordates* { *Edw. III. and P. Greg. XI. Anno 1373.*

between { *Henry V. and P. Mart. V. Anno 1418.*

34. When *Princes* were fain to curb their exorbitances by *Pragmatical Sanctions*, they were restless till they had got those *Sanctions* revoked. And when they found weak *Princes*, or any Prince in circumstances advantaging their design, they did obtain their end. So Pope *Leo X.* got *Lewis XI.* to repeal the *Pragmatical Sanctions* of his Ancestors.

35. The Power he did assume to absolve Men from Oaths and Vows, to dispence with prohibited Marriages, &c. did not only bring much grist to his Mill; but did enable him highly to oblige divers persons (especially great ones) to himself. For to him they owed the quiet of their Conscience from scruples. To him they owed the satisfaction of their desires, and legitimation of their issue, and title to their Possessions.

36. So the device of Indulgences did greatly raise the veneration of him; for who would not adore him, that could loose bands, and free his Soul from long and grievous pains?



## S U P P O S I T I O N VI.

The next *Supposition* is this, *That in Fact the Roman Bishops continually from Saint Peter's time have enjoyed and exercised this Sovereign Power.*

**T**HIS is a Question of Fact which will best be decided by a particular consideration of the several Branches of Sovereign Power, that so we may examine the more distinctly whether in all Ages the Popes have enjoyed and exercised them, or not.

And if we survey the particular Branches of Sovereignty, we shall find that the Pope hath no just title to them, in reason, by valid Law, or according to ancient Practice, whence each of them doth yield a good argument against his pretences.

I. If the Pope were Sovereign of the Church, he would have power to convocate its supreme Councils and Judicatories; and would constantly have exercised it.

This power therefore the Pope doth claim; and indeed did pretend to it a long time since, before they could obtain to exercise it: *It is manifestly apparent* (saith Pope Leo X. with approbation of his Lateran Synod) *that the Roman Bishop for the time being (as who hath authority over all Councils) hath alone the full right and power of indicting, translating and dissolving Councils: and long before him, To the Apostolical authority (saith Pope Adrian I.) by our Lord's command, and by the merits of Saint Peter, and by the decrees of the Holy Canons and of the venerable Fathers, a right and special power of convocating Synods hath many-wise been committed; and yet before him, The authority (saith Pope Pelagius II.) of convocating Synods hath been delivered to the Apostolical: See by the singular privilege of Saint Peter.*

But it is manifest, that the Pope cannot pretend to this power by virtue of any old Ecclesiastical Canon; none such being extant or produced by him: Nor can he alledge any ancient Custom; there having been no General Synod before *Constantine*: and as to the practice from that time, it is very clear, that for some Ages the Popes did not assume or exercise such a power, and that it was not taken for their due. Nothing can be more evident and it were extreme impudence to deny that the Emperors at their pleasure, and by their authority did congregate all the first General Synods; for so the oldest Historians in most express terms do report, so those Princes in their Edicts did aver, so the Synods themselves did declare. The most just and pious Emperors, who did bear greatest love to the Clergy, and had much respect for the Pope, did call them without scruple; it was deemed their right to do it, none did remonstrate against their practice, the Fathers in each Synod did refer thereto, with allowance, and commonly with applause; Popes themselves did not contest their right, yea commonly did petition them to exercise it.

These things are so clear and so obvious, that it is almost vain to prove them; I shall therefore but touch them.

*Distinct. 17.*

*Cum etiam solum Rom. Pontificem pro tempore existentem, tanquam auctoritatem super omnia Concilia habentem, Conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum ac dissolvendorum plenum jus & potestatem habere—manifeste constat. Con. Later. Sess. 11. (p. 152.) Ann.*

*—Cui jussione Domini, & meritis B. Petri Apostoli, singularis congregandarum Synodorum auctoritas, & Sanctorum Canonum ac Venerandorum Patrum decretis multipliciter privata tradita est potestas. P. Hadrian I. apud Bin. Tom. 5. p. 565. (Anno 785.)*

*Cum generalium Synodorum convocandi auctoritas Apostolicæ Sedis B. Petri singulari privilegio sit tradita—P. Pelag. II. Epist. 8. (Bin. Tom. 4. p. 476.) Anno 587. quæ hæc Epistola sit Pelagii II. Negat Launojus.*

Συνεχῶς καὶ τοῦ βασιλεὺς τῇ ἰσχυρίᾳ θεο-  
λαμβάνουσαν. ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν ἡ-  
ξαῖσθ, καὶ ὁ Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτα ἡρώτη ἐξ  
αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτοὶ μάλιστα συνέθετο τῇ αὐτῶν γυναικὶ  
ἡγεμονίᾳ τε καὶ γένει. Socr. 5. proam.

Semper studium fuit Orthodoxis, & pi-  
is imperatoribus, pro tempore exortas He-  
reses per congregationem religiosissimorum  
Episcoporum amputare, & recta fide sin-  
cere prædicata, in pace Sanctam Dei Ec-  
clesiam custodire. Justin. in Syn. 5.  
Collat. 1. (p. 209) Grace p. 368. magis  
Emphaticè.

Deo—quis Imperator hanc Synodum  
jussit congregari. Hier.

in peace : and to do this was so proper to the Emperours : that when *Ruffin*  
did affirm *St. Hilary* to have been excommunicated in a Synod, *St. Hie-*  
*rome* to confute him, did ask ; tell me, *What Empe-*  
*ror* did command this Synod to be congregated ; imply-  
ing it to be illegal or impossible that a Synod should be congregated with-  
out the Imperial command.

Οὐδὲ τις κοινῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ δι-  
αμυστῆς συνόδου τῶν Θεῶν λειτουργῶν συν-  
αχῆς. Euseb. de Vir. Const. l. 44

Πλείους ἐκ διαφορῶν καὶ ἀμυντικῶν τόπων  
Ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὴν Ἀρελάτῃσιον πόλιν συνα-  
δῶν ἐκελευσάμενος. Euseb. Hist. 10. 5. Ep. d  
Chrestum. Ad Arelatenſium civitatem  
piſſimi Imperatoris voluntate adducti,  
lay the Fathers in their Epistle to P. Syl-  
vester himself.

Vid. Euseb. de Vir. Const. lib. 4. cap.  
41, 42, 43. & Socr. 1. 28.

General Synods) all the Historians do agree, he did himself affirm, the  
Fathers thereof in their Synodical remonstrances did avow ; as we shall  
hereafter, in remarking on the passages of that Synod shew.

The same course did his Son *Constantius* follow, without impediment ;  
for although he was a favourer of the *Arian* Party, yet did the *Catholic*  
Bishops readily at his call assemble in the great Synods of \* *Sardica*, of  
† *Ariminum*, of ‖ *Seleucia*, of \* *Sirmium*, of † *Milan*, &c. Which he out

\* Περὶ τῆς  
ἐν εἰς  
Σαρδικίᾳ  
συνόδου

μὲν Ἐπισκόπος. Theod. 2. 4. Soz. 3. 11. Socr. 2. 16, 20. Athan. Tom. 1. p. 761. Hil. in fragm. p. 7ubet ex toto  
erbe apud Sardicam Episcopos congregari. Sulp. 2. 52. † Ἐκ τῆς ἐν Θεῶν καλῶντος, καὶ τῆς οὐκ ἐνοχίας πρὸς τὴν  
τῆς, &c. Syn. Arim. Ep. ad Const. Socr. 2. 37. ‖ Socr. 2. 39. ἢ—ἡμεῖς τὴν βασιλείαν ἐκέλευσεν πρὸς τὴν  
\* Ὁ βασιλεὺς συνέθετο Ἐπισκόπων ἐν τῇ Σερμίου πόλει ἐκέλευσεν. Socr. 2. 99. Soz. 4. 6. † Περὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ πόλει  
ἐν Μεσολογγίᾳ πόλεως συνεθροίσθη τὸ συνέδριον. Socr. 1. 36. Soz. 4. 9.

Ἐν τῇ τῇ Ἰλλυρικῇ συνέθετο ἡμεῖς πρὸς  
ἐν τῇ. Theod. 4. 7.

A while after, for settlement of the Christian State (which had been  
greatly disturbed by the Persecution of *Julian* and of *Valens*, and by divers

Συνέθετο ὁμοθυμῶν αὐτῶν συναχῆς.  
Soz. 7. 7. Socr. 5. 8.

Μένει τῆς οἰκίας βασιλείας τοῦ Ἐπισκό-  
που εἰς τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλιν συναθροισθῆναι  
πρὸς τὴν. Theod. 5. 7.

Repugnante Damaso celebrata, &c. Ba-  
ron. Anno 553. § 224.

Afterwards, when *Nestorius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, affecting to seem  
wiser than others in explaining the mystery of Christ's Incarnation, had  
raised a jangle to the disturbance of the Church. For removing it, the

Πρὸς τὴν τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν συνέθετο  
συναθροισθῆναι ἐκέλευσεν. Socr. 7. 34. Evagr. 1. 3.

In general *Socrates* doth thus attest to the an-  
cient practice ; *We* (saith he) do continually in-  
clude the Emperors in our History, because upon them,  
ever since they became Christians, Ecclesiastical affairs  
have depended, and the greatest Synods have been and are  
made by their appointment : and *Justinian* in his pre-  
fatory type to the Fifth General Council beginneth  
thus : It hath been ever the care of Pious and Orthodox  
Emperors by the assembling of the most religious Bishops  
to cut off Heresies, as they did spring up, and by the right  
faith sincerely preach'd, to keep the Holy Church of God

Particularly *Eusebius* saith of the first Christian  
Emperor, that as a common Bishop appointed by God  
he did summon Synods of God's Ministers ; so did he  
command a great number of Bishops to meet at *Arles*,  
(for decision of the *Donatists* cause ; ) so did he al-  
so command the Bishops from all quarters to meet  
at *Tyre* for examination of the affairs concerning  
*Athanasius* ; and that he did convocate the great  
Synod of *Nice* (the first and most renowned of all

After him the Emperor *Valentinian*, understand-  
ing of dissensions about divine matters to com-  
pose them, did indict a Synod in *Illyricum*.

(which had been  
greatly disturbed by the Persecution of *Julian* and of *Valens*, and by divers  
Factions.) *Theodosius* I. did command (saith *Theodo-*  
*ret*) the Bishops of his Empire to be assembled together at  
*Constantinople*, the which meeting accordingly did  
make the Second General Synod ; in the congrega-  
tion of which the Pope had so little to do, that  
*Baronius* saith, it was celebrated against his will.

Afterwards, when *Nestorius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, affecting to seem  
wiser than others in explaining the mystery of Christ's Incarnation, had  
raised a jangle to the disturbance of the Church. For removing it, the  
Emperor *Theodosius* II. did by his edict command  
the Bishops to meet at *Ephesus* ; who there did cele-  
brate the Third General Council : in the begin-  
ning

ning of each *Action* it is affirm'd, that the Synod was convoked by the Imperial degree; the Synod it self doth often profess it; the Pope's own Legate doth acknowledge it; and so doth Cyril the President thereof.

Θεὸς καὶ τὸ δέσποτα τὸ εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων σύσκεπτι δέσποτα. Syn. Eph. Añ. 1. p. 291.  
The holy Synod assembled by the grace of God, according to the Decree of our most Religious Emperors, &c.

ἢ χἀετι Θεὸς καὶ πιδέματι τῶν ὑμῶν κερταίς ὡσαυθέστω. Añ. 5. p. 347.  
Τὸ πρῶτον ἐκείνη τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ παρὰ τῶν ὑμῶν κερταίς, &c.

Τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐκείνων καὶ πρῶτον ἐκείνων βασιλέων. p. 404.  
Ἡσὺνα συνόδῳ οἱ ἁγιοὶ ἰκόντιοι καὶ φιλαδρεπταῖοι βασιλεῖς ὤκουν.

Which Synod our most Chritlian and gracious Emperors appointed, faith Philip, the Pope's Legate. Añ. 3. p. 330.  
Τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τῇ καὶ Θεὸς χἀεν καὶ δέσποτα τῶν ὑμῶν κερταίς καὶ φιλοχρίστων βασιλέων ὡσαυθέστω.

To the holy Synod assembled by the grace of God, and the command of our Emperors, &c. So do Cyril and Memnon inscribe in there Epistle. Añ 4. p. 337.

The same Emperor, upon occasion of *Eutyches* being condemned at *Constantinople*, and the stirr thence arising, did indict the Second General Synod of *Ephesus*, (which proved abortive by the miscarriages of *Dioscorus*, Bishop of *Alexandria*) as appeareth by his Imperial Letters to *Dioscorus*, and the other Bishops, summoning them to that Synod:—*We have decreed that the most holy Bishops meeting together, &c. After the same manner the other most reverend Bishops were written to, to come to the Synod. And as Pope Leo doth confess; calling it the Council of Bishops which you (Theodosius) commanded to be held at Ephesus.*

The next General Synod of *Chalcedon* was convoked by the authority of the Emperor *Marcian*; as is expressed in the beginning of each *Action*, as the Emperor declar-eth, as the Synod it self in the front of its definition doth avow; the holy, great and Oecumenical Synod gather'd together by the grace of God and the command of our most dread Emperors, &c. has determin'd as follows.

The Fifth General Synod was also congregated by the authority of *Justinian I.* and the Emperor's Letter authorizing it, beginning (as we saw before) with an assertion (backed with a particular enumeration) that all former great Synods were called by the same power: the Fathers themselves do say, that they had come together according to the will of God, and the command of the most pious Emperor. So little had the Pope to do in it, that, as *Baronius* himself telleth us, it was congregated against his will, or with his resistance.

The Sixth General Synod at *Constantinople* was also indicted by the Emperor *Constantine Pogonatas*; as doth appear by his Letters, as is intimated at the entrance of each *Action*, as the Synod doth acknowledge, as Pope *Leo II.* (in whose time it was concluded) doth affirm. The Synod in its definition, as also in its Epistle to Pope *Agatho* doth inscribe it self *The Holy and Oecumenical Synod, congregated by the grace of God, and the altogether religious Sanction of the most pious, and most faithful great Emperor Constantine*; and, in their definition they say, *By this doctrine of peace dictated by God, our most gracious Emperor through the divine Wisdom being guided, as a defender of the true Faith, and an enemy to the false, having gather'd us together in this holy and Oecumenical Synod, has united the whole frame of the Church, &c. In its accla-*

Ἐπιστολῇ καὶ τῷ ταῦτο ὡσαυθέστω ὁσιότητων, &c.

Τῷ αὐτῷ πύπρ ἐξέστη καὶ πρὸς ἄλλοις ἐκ-  
λαβεστάτοις Ἐπισκόποις ὡς ἐξ ἡμετέρων ἐκείνων  
σύνόδων Syn. Chalc. pars 1. p. 53.

Episcopale consilium, quod haberi apud  
Ephesum praecepistis. P. Leo. I. Ep. 23.  
(Ἔ 24.) ad Theod.

Κατὰ δὴ τὸν δέσποτα ὡσαυθέστω.  
Τῷ ἁγίῳ ὑμῶν ἡδρῶσι μὲν συνόδῳ.  
(Añ 6. p. 345.)

Ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ συνόδος  
ἡ καὶ Θεὸς χἀεν, καὶ δέσποτα τῶν ὑμῶν κερταίς  
καὶ φιλοχρίστων ἡμῶν βασιλέων ὡσαυθέστω  
ἀφ' ἐκείνων — ὡσαυτὰ τὰ ὑποπαραμύδια.  
Añ 6. 346.

Pro Dei voluntate, Et jussione piissimi  
Imperatoris ad hanc urbem convenimus.  
Collat. 8.

Ut quae resistente Romano Pontifice fue-  
rit congregata. Baron Ann 553. §. 219.

Ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη, καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ συν-  
όδος, ἡ καὶ Θεὸς χἀεν καὶ πανδότης δέ-  
σποτα τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ πρῶτον ἐκείνων  
βασιλέων Κωνσταντίνῳ ὡσαυθέστω. Añ.  
18. p. 255. Ἔ p. 285. (in Epist. ad P.  
Agath.)

Ταῦτη τῇ διολέγει τὴν εἰρήνης διδασκα-  
λίαν διδοῦσαν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς  
ὁ δὴν ἐκείνων, ὁ καὶ μὲν ὁρτοδοξίας ἀπομα-  
χῶν, καὶ τὴν ἡλικιδοξίας ἀντήμαχον, καὶ  
κατὰ ἡμῶν ἁγίας ταύτην καὶ οἰκουμενικὴν  
ἐκείνων ὁ μὴν ὡσαυτὰ τὰ ὑποπαραμύδια.  
Añ. 18. p. 256. in defini-  
tione Synodica.

matory





(said he, as Theodoret reports) should be made with great equity; wherefore if it please your Piety, command a Judicatory to be constituted; and in his Epistle to Hosius, produced by Baronius, he saith, Many Bishops out of Italy met together, who together with me had beseecht the most Religious Emperor, that he would command, as he had thought fit, the Council of Aquileia to meet.

So Pope Damasus, having a desire that a General Synod should be celebrated in Italy for repressing Heresies and Factions then in the Church did obtain the Imperial Letters for that purpose directed to the Eastern Bishops, as they in their Epistle to the Western Bishops do intimate: But because expressing a brotherly affection toward us, ye have called us as your own Members by the most pious Emperor's Letters to that Synod which by the will of God ye are gathering at Rome.

It is a wonder that Bellarmine should have the confidence to alledge this Bell de passage for himself. Pont. R. 1.

So again Pope Innocent I. being desirous to restore St. Chrysostom, did (as Sozomen telleth us) send five Bishops and two Priests of the Roman Church to Honorius and to Arcadius the Emperor, requesting a Synod, with the time and the place thereof; in which attempt he suffered a repulse; for the Courtiers of Arcadius did repel those Agents, as troubling another Government, which was beyond their bounds, or wherein the Pope had nothing to do, that they knew of.

So also Pope Leo I. (whom no Pope could well exceed in zeal to maintain the Privileges and advance the Eminence of his See) did in these terms request Theodosius to indict a Synod; whence if your piety shall vouchsafe consent to our suggestion and supplication, that you would command an Episcopal Council to be held in Italy; soon, God aiding, may all scandals be cut off: upon this occasion the Emperor did appoint a Council (not in Italy according to the Popes desire, but) at Ephesus; the which Pope Leo again did address to Theodosius in these words, All the Churches of our parts, all Bishops with groans and tears do supplicate your Grace, that you would command a General Synod to be celebrated within Italy; to which request (although back'd with the desire of the Western Emperor) Theodosius would by no means consent; for, as Leontius reporteth, when Valentinian being importuned by Pope Leo, did write to Theodosius II, that he would procure another Synod to be held for examining whether Dioscorus had judged rightly or no, Theodosius did write back to him saying, I shall make no other Synod.

The same Pope did again of the same Emperor petition for a Synod to examine the cause of Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople: Let your clemency (saith he) be pleased to grant an Universal Council to be held in Italy; as with me the Synod, which for this cause did meet at Rome, doth request; Thus did that Pope continually harp upon one string to get a General Synod to be celebrated

Διότι εἰς δεξιῇ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ κατέλιπον συζητῆσαι κἀκδοσιν. Theod. 2. 16.

Multis ex Italia Episcopi convenerunt, qui mecum religiosissimum Imperatorem fuerant deprecari, ut juberet. sicut ipsi placuerat, dudum concilium Aquileense congregari. Baron. Ann. 353 § 19.

Ἐπειδὴν μέντοι ἡ ἀδελφικὴ εὐχὴ ἡμῶν ἀγάπῃ ἐπαρκευμένη, συνδόν ὅτι ἡ Ρωμαίων Θεῶν βασιλεὺς (ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς οἰκεία μὲν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς βασιλεῖς γενομένων. Theod. 5. 9.

Πέμπουσαν Ἐπισκοπὴν πάντες καὶ ἀρεσκόμενοι διὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων Ἐκκλησίας πρὸς Ὁριεῖον, καὶ Ἀρχιδιόν ἡ βασιλεῖα, συνδόν αἰτησίσας, καὶ καμὲν ταύτης καὶ τόπον. Soz. 8. 28.

Ὡς ὑποδείκνυται ἀρχὴν ἐνοχλήσεως. Ibid.

Humiliter ac sapienter exposite, ut petitioni nostrae, quā plenariam indici Synodum postulamus, clementissimus Imperator dignetur annuere, (saith Pope Leo, to the Clergy and People of Constantinople. Ep. 23.)

Unde si pietas vestra suggestioni ac supplicationi nostrae dignetur annuere, ut intra Italiam haberi jubeatis Episcopale Concilium, citò auxiliante Deo poterunt omnia scandala refecari. P. Leo I. Ep. 9.

not succeeding well,

Omnes partium Ecclesie nostrarum, omnes mansuetudini vestrae cum gemitibus & lacrymis supplicant sacerdotes, ut generalem Synodum jubeatis intra Italiam celebrari. P. Leo I. Ep. 42.

Ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἔλαβε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ Πάπᾳ, γὰρ ὁ Θεοδόσιος τῇ μικρῇ, ἵνα ἐπιπέμῃ συνδόν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ γινῆναι εἰ καλῶς ἐκείνῃ ὁ Διόσκορος ἢ ὁ ὁ Θεοδόσιος ἀνέγχεσθαι αὐτῷ λέγων, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συνέδρις. Leont. de Sect. Act. 4.

celebrated at his own doors; but never could obtain his purpose, the Emperor being stiff in refusing it.

*\*Sanctum clementiae vestrae studium, quo ad reparationem pacis Ecclesiastica Synodum habere voluistis, adeo libenter accepi, ut quamvis eam fieri intra Italiam poposcissem, &c. Leo Ep. 50.*

*Poposceram quidem à gloriosissima clementia vestra, ut Synodum, quam pro reparanda Orientalis Ecclesiae pace à nobis etiam petitam necessariam iudicastis, aliquantisper differri ad tempus opportunius juberetis — P. Leo Ep. 43. 44. 50.*

*Sed eo defuncto, cum Martianus Imperii culmen fuisset adeptus, pro illa Papae & Principum Romanorum petitione Universale Concilium in Nicena congregari iussit. Lib. Brev. cap. 13.*

The same Pope, with better success, (as \* to the thing, though not as to the place) did request of the Emperor *Marcian* a Synod; for he (concurring in opinion that it was needful) *did* (faith *Liberatus*) *at the petition of the Pope and the Roman Princes command a General Council to be congregated at Nice.*

*\* Fortissimus Leo Liber. cap. 12.*

Now, if the Pope had himself a known right to convocate Synods, what needed all this supplication, or this application to the Emperors? would not the Pope have endeavoured to exercise his Authority? would he not have clamoured or whined at any interruption thereof? would so spiritul and sturdy a Pope as *Leo* \* have begged that to be done by another, which he had authority to do of himself, when he did apprehend so great necessity for it, and was so much provoked thereto? would he not at least have remonstrated against the injury therein done to him by *Theodosius*.

*— in causa fidei, propter quam Generale Concilium & ex praecepto Christianorum Principum, & ex consensu Apostolicae Sedis placuit congregari. Ep. 61.*

All that this daring Pope could adventure at, was to wind in a pretence that the Synod of *Chalcedon* was congregated by his consent; for, *it hath been the pleasure (of whom I pray) that a General Council should be congregated, both by the command of the Christian Princes, and with the consent of the Apostolick See, faith he very cunningly; yet not so cunningly, but that any other Bishop might have said the same for his See.*

*1 Tim. 2.2.*

*Isa. 49. 23.*

*Sap. 6. 4.*

*Rom. 13. 3.*

*2 Chron.*

*34. 29. &c.*

This power indeed upon many just accounts peculiarly doth belong to Princes; It suteth to the dignity of their state, it appertaineth to their duty, they are most able to discharge it. They are the Guardians of publick tranquillity, which constantly is endangered, which commonly is violated by dissentions in religious matters; (whence we must pray for them, that by their care *we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty,*) they alone can authorize their Subjects to take such Journeys, or to meet in such Assemblies; they alone can well cause the expences needful for holding Synods to be exacted and defrayed; they alone can protect them, can maintain Order and Peace in them, can procure Observance to their Determinations; they alone have a Sword to constrain resty and refractory Persons (and in no cases are Men so apt to be such as in debates about these matters) to convene, to confer peaceably, to agree, to observe what is settled: They, as *nursing Fathers of the Church, as Ministers of God's Kingdom, as encouragers of good Works*; as the Stewards of God, entrusted with the great Talents of Power, Dignity, Wealth, enabling them to serve God, are obliged to cause Bishops in such cases to perform their duty; according to the example of good Princes in Holy Scripture, who are commended for proceedings of this nature; for so King *Josias* did convocate a General Synod of the Church in his time, *then* (faith the Text) *the King sent, and gathered together all the Elders of Judah and Jerusalem*; In this Synod he presided, *standing in his place; and making a Covenant before the Lord*; its Resolutions he confirmed, *causing all that were present in Jerusalem and Benjamin to stand to that Covenant*; and he took care of their Execution, *making all present in Israel effectually to serve the Lord their God.*



So also did King *Hezekiah* gather the *Priests and Levites together*, did warn, <sup>2 Chron.</sup> did command them to do their duty, and reform things in the Church: <sup>29. 4. 15.</sup> *My Sons* (said he) *be not now negligent, for the Lord hath chosen you to stand before* <sup>20, 21, &c.</sup> *him, to serve him, and that ye should minister unto him, and burn incense.* <sup>Verf. 11.</sup>

Beside them none other can have reasonable pretence to such a Power, or can well be deemed able to manage it: so great an Authority cannot be exercised upon the Subjects of any Prince without eclipsing his Majesty, infringing his natural right, and endangering his State. He that at his pleasure can summon all Christian Pastours, and make them trot about, and hold them when he will, is in effect Emperor, or in a fair way to make himself so. It is not fit therefore that any other person should have all the Governours of the Church at his beck, so as to draw them from remote places whither he pleaseth; to put them on long and chargeable Journeys; to detain them from their charge; to set them on what deliberations and debates he thinketh good. It is not reasonable that any one without the leave of Princes should authorize so great conventions of Men, having such interest and sway; it is not safe, that any one should have such dependencies on him, by which he may be tempted to clash with Princes, and withdraw his Subjects from their due obedience. Neither can any success be well expected from the use of such authority by any, who hath not power, by which he can force Bishops to convene, to resolve, to obey; whence we see that *Constantine*, who was a Prince so gentle and friendly to the Clergy, was put to threaten those Bishops, who would absent themselves from the Synod indicted by him at *Tyre*; and

*Theodosius* (also a very mild and religious Prince) did the like in his summoning the two *Ephesine* Synods. We likewise may observe, that when the *Pope and Western Bishops*, in a Synodical Epistle, did invite those in the East to a great Synod indicted at *Rome*, these did refuse the Journey, alledging that it would be to no good purpose; so also when the *Western Bishops* did call those of the East, for resolving the difference between *Flavianus* and *Paulinus*, both pretending to be Bishops of *Antioch*, what effect had their summons? and so will they always or often be ready to say, who are called at the pleasure of those who want force to constrain them; so that such Authority in unarmed hands (and God keep Arms out of the Pope's hands) will be only a source of discords.

Either the Pope is a Subject, as he was in the first times, and then it were too great a presumption for him to claim such a power over his fellow-Subjects in prejudice to his Sovereign; (nor indeed did he presume so far, untill he had in a manner shaken off subjection to the Emperor) or he is not a Subject; and then it is not reasonable that he should have such power in the Territories of another Prince.

The whole business of General Synods, was an expedient for Peace, contrived by Emperors, and so to be regulated by their order. Hence even in times and places where the Pope was most revered, yet Princes were jealous of suffering the Pope to exercise such a power over the Bishops their Subjects; and to obviate it, did command all Bishops not to stir out of their Territories without licence; particularly our own Nation, in the Council at *Clarendon*, where it was decreed, *that they should not go out of the Kingdom without the King's leave.*

B b

Τὸ πρεσβυτεριὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀλλοθῶς ἐκ-  
κλησιασμένους ἐκέλευε.  
— ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεοδοσιος πρὸς  
σφόδρα ἐξέβη πάντας τοὺς ἀνδράπλους τοὺς  
ὄντας ἐκ τῆς γῆς. Socr. 7. 42.

Τὼ ἀποδημίας παρήσαντο ὡς ἐξὶν  
ἐχούσαν κέρδος. Theod. 5. 8.

Ἐγενεον αὐτοῖσι, καὶ Γερασίου ὁ βα-  
σιλεὺς, συγκαλέντες εἰς τὴν δύσιν τοὺς  
ἐκ τῆς ἀνατολῆς Ἐπισκόπους. Soz. 7. 11.

Both they and *Gratian* the Emperor wrote, calling the Eastern Bishops into the West.

*Philip of France.* Bin. Tom. 7. p. 906.  
(Ann. 1302.)

*Decretum est—non licere—exire  
Regnum absque licentia Regis. Conc. Cla-  
rend. vid. Matt. Par. Ann. 1164.*

To

To some things above said a passage may be objected which occur-  
reth in the acclamation of the Sixth Synod to the Emperor *Constantine*

Syn. Sext. Act. 18. p. 272.  
Κωνσταντίνῳ ὁ ἀποστόλος, καὶ Σιλβέ-  
στοῦ ὁ ἀποστόλος, καὶ ἐν Νικαίᾳ μετὰ τὴν τε καὶ  
πρεσβυτέρων Σύνοδον.

— ἂν ὁ μέγας βίσιλδος Θεοδοσίῳ,  
καὶ Δάμασῳ ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῆς πίστεως — Γρη-  
γορίου καὶ Νεκταρίου καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ βασι-  
λεὶ πόλιν Σύνοδον συλλογόντων.

Πάλιν Νεκταρίου, καὶ πάλιν Κελεστίνῳ,  
καὶ Κυρολλῳ, ὁ μὲν καὶ Χρυσὸν δίδωται, καὶ κα-  
τὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, οἱ δὲ τῶν διακόνων Συλλογιστῶν  
μὲν οὖν τῶν πᾶν σκήπτρον διακόνων, καὶ  
κατατομία κατέβαλλον —

*Pogonatus*; wherein 'tis said, that *Constantine* and  
*Sylvester* did collect the Synod of *Nice*, *Theodo-*  
*sus I.* and *Damasus* (together with *Gregory* and  
*Nectarius*) the Synod of *Constantinople*; *Theodo-*  
*sus II.* with *Celestine* and *Cyril* the *Ephesine* Synod,  
and so of the rest: To which I answer, that the  
Fathers mean only for the honour of those Pre-  
lates to signify, that they in their places and ways  
did concur and co-operate to the celebration of  
those Synods; otherwise we might as to matter  
of Fact and History contest the accurateness of

their relation; and 'tis observable, that they joyn other great Bishops  
then flourishing, with the Popes; so that if their suffrage prove any thing,  
it proveth more than our Adversaries would have, viz. that all great  
Bishops and Patriarchs have a power or right to convocate Synods.

As for passages alledged by our Adversaries, that no Synod could be  
called, or Ecclesiastical Law enacted, without consent of the Pope, they  
are no-wise pertinent to this question; for we do not deny that the Pope  
had a right to sit in every General Synod; and every other Patriarch at

Ἀναγνωστῶν τῶν τῶν Συνοδικῶν καὶ δια-  
κριτικῶν μὴ δὲν γινώσκοντες ποτὲ σύνοδον ἐκ-  
κλησιαστικὴν παρακτὴς (συμφωνίας καὶ λοιπῶν  
ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Πατριάρχων. *Antea* Syn.  
Nic. II. p. 518.

Οὐκ ἐστὶν Συμερὶν καὶ πανικαῦτα καὶ ῥω-  
μαίων Πατριάρχων καὶ νόμος οὗτος καὶ  
συνόδους ἀλλ' ὅτε συμφωνίας αὐτῇ τῇ  
Πατριαρχίᾳ καὶ ἑ. Syn. 7. Act. 6. p. 725.

Διὰ τοῦτο τὰς Πατριαρχίας κεφαλὰς ἐν  
τῷ κόσμῳ ἔθετο τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἵνα τὰ  
ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ Θεῷ ἀναρμόδια σκάν-  
δαλα δι' αὐτῶν ἀναρμύζων. Syn. 8. Act. 1.  
p. 930.

Ἀποστολὴν τῶν καίσις, ὡς ἐκ τῆς  
ἐκκλησίας ἔθετο, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν Πατριαρ-  
χικῶν γνομην, Act. 5. p. 945.

least had no less; as all reason and practice do  
shew; and as they of the Seventh Synod do  
suppose, arguing the Synod of *Constantinople*,  
which condemned the worship of Images, to be  
no General Council, because it had not the Pope's  
co-operation, nor the consent of the Eastern Patriarchs.  
*Syncellus* the Patriarch of *Jerusalem's* Legate in  
the Eighth Synod, says, for this reason did the Holy  
Spirit set up Patriarchs in the World, that they might  
suppress Scandals arising in the Church of God: And  
*Photius* is in the same Synod told that the judgment  
past against him was most equal and impartial, as  
proceeding not from one but all the four Patri-  
archs.

That a General Synod doth not need a Pope to call it, or preside in it,  
(p. 1109.) appeareth by what the Synods of *Pisa* and *Constance* define, for provision  
in time of Schisms.

II. It inseparably doth belong to Sovereigns in the General Assemblies  
of their States to preside, and moderate affairs; proposing what they  
judge fit to be consulted or debated; stopping what seemeth unfit to be  
moved; keeping proceedings within order and rule, and steering them to  
a good issue; checking disorders and irregularities, which the distemper  
or indiscretion of any persons may create in deliberations or disputes.

This privilege therefore the Pope doth claim; not allowing any Ge-  
neral Council to be legitimate, wherein he in person, or by his Legates,

Catholici omnes id munus proprium esse  
docent summus Pontifex, ut se se, vel  
per Legatos presideat, & tanquam su-  
premus iudex omnia moderetur. Bell de  
Conc. 117.

doth not preside and sway. All Catholics, says  
*Bellarmino*, teach this to be the chief Pontif's proper  
Office, that either in person or by his Legate he preside,  
and as a chief Judge moderate all.

But for this Prerogative no express Grant from God, no ancient Canon  
of the Church, no certain Custom can be produced.

Nor doth ancient practice favour the Pope's claim to such a Pre-  
rogative, it appearing that he did not exercise it in the first General  
Synods.

Saint

Saint Peter himself did not preside in the Apostolical Synod at *Jerusalem*, where he was present; but rather St. James, as we before have shewed.

In all the first Synods, convoked by Emperors, they did either themselves in person, or by honourable persons authorized by them, in effect preside, governing the proceedings.

In the Synod of *Nice*, *Constantine* was the chief Manager, Director, and Moderator of the Transactions; and under him other chief Bishops did preside; but that the Pope's Legates had any considerable influence or sway there, doth by no evidence appear; as we shall hereafter out of History declare.

In the Synod of *Sardica*, (which in design was a General Council, but in effect did not prove so, being divided by a Schism into two great parts) *Hosius* Bishop of *Corduba* did preside, (or by reason of his age and venerable worth) had the first place assigned to him, and bore the Office of Proloquutor; so the Synod it self doth imply;

*All we Bishops* (say they in their Catholick Epistle) *meeting together, and especially the most ancient Hosius, who for his age, and for his confession, and for that he hath undergone so much pains, is worthy all reverence; so Athanasius expressly doth call him; The holy Synod* (saith he) *the Proloquutor of which was the great Hosius, presently sent to them, &c.* The Canons of the Synod intimate the same, wherein he proposeth matters, and asketh the pleasure of the Synod; the same is confirmed by the subscriptions of their General Epistle; wherein he is set before Pope *Julius* himself. (*Hosius from Spain, Julius of Rome, by the Presbyters, Archidamus and Philoxenus.*) In this all Ecclesiastical Histories do agree; none speaking of the Pope's presiding there by his Legates.

In the Second General Synod at *Constantinople* the Pope had plainly no stroke; the Oriental Bishops alone did there resolve on matters, being headed by their Patriarchs; (of *Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem*,) as *Sozomen* saith; being guided by *Nectarius* and *Saint Gregory Nazianzene*, as the Council of *Chalcedon* in its Epistle to the Emperor doth aver.

*Conc. Chalcedonensis in Epist. ad Imp. Marc. (p. 469)*

In the Third General Synod at *Ephesus*, *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria* did preside; as Pope *Leo* himself doth testify; he is called *the Head of it*, in the Acts.

*Cyrillus Episcopus tunc presedit. P. Leo I. Ep. 47. Κεφαλὴ τῆς Συνελευσεως ἀγιάτων Ἐπισκόπων Κόνσταντινουπόλεως.*

We may note, that the Bishop of the place where the Synod is held, did bear a kind of presidency in all Synods; so did Saint James Bishop of *Jerusalem* in the First Synod, as St. Chrysostom noteth; so did *Prologenes* at *Sardica*, and *Nectarius* at *Constantinople*, and *Memnon* in this of *Ephesus*.

It is true, that according to the Acts of that Synod, and the reports of divers Historians, Pope *Celestine* (according to a new politick device of Popes) did authorize *Cyril* to represent his person, and act as his



Proctor in those affairs; assigning to him (as he saith) *jointly both the authority of his throne* (that is, his right of voting) *and the order of his place* (the first place in sitting;) but it is not consequent thence, that

Συναφείσθαι οὐ τὸ αὐθιγὲς τὰ ὑμῶν  
θρόνον, καὶ τῇ ὑμῶν τὰ τύπον διαδοχῇ. Ce-  
lest. ad Cyril. Relat. cap. 16.

N. Yet the Fathers in their Epistle to Pope Celestine do only take notice of Arcadius, Proclus, and Philippus supplying his place. Act. p. 353.

Cyril upon that sole account did preside in the Synod. He thereby had the disposal of one so considerable suffrage; or a legal concurrence of the Pope with him in his actings; He thereby might pretend to the first place of sitting and subscribing (which kind of advantages it appeareth that some Bishops had in Synods by the

virtue of the like substitution in the place of others) but he thence could have no authoritative Presidency; for that the Pope himself could by no delegation impart, having himself no title thereto, warranted by any Law, or by any Precedent; that depended on the Emperor's will, or on the Election of the Fathers, or on a tacit regard to personal eminence in comparison to others present: This distinction

Κυρίλλῳ τὸ πρῶτον δίδοντο καὶ τὸ  
Κελεστίνῳ τὸν. Evagr. 1. 4.

fallen out) and Zonoras

Προσμενόμενῳ τῷ Ὁρθόδοξον Πατέρων τῶ  
ἐν ἁγίοις Κυρίλλῳ Πάπᾳ Ἀλεξανδρείας,  
ἐπὶ τοῦτο ὅτι καὶ τὸν Κελεστίνῳ. Zon. in  
Syn. Eph. Can. 1.

Τὸ Ῥώμης Κελεστίνῳ ἐπὶ τῷ καὶ δέδωκεν  
καὶ πρῶτον.

Evagrius seemeth to intimate, when he saith, that the divine Cyril did administer it, and the place of Celestine (where a word seemeth to have more plainly doth express; saying, that Cyril Pope of Alexandria did preside over the Orthodox Fathers, and also did hold the place of Celestine: and Photius; Cyril did supply the seat, and the person of Celestine. If any latter Historians do confound these things, we are not obliged to comply with their ignorance or mistake.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Indeed as to Presidency there we may observe, that sometime it is attributed to Cyril alone, as being the first Bishop present, and bearing a great sway; sometimes to Pope Celestine, as being in representation present, and being the first Bishop of the Church in Order; sometimes to both Cyril and Celestine; sometimes to Cyril and Memnon Bishop of Ephesus, who as being very active, and having great influence on the proceedings, are stiled the Presidents and Rulers of the Synod. The which sheweth, that Presidency was a lax thing, and no peculiarity in right or usage annexed to the Pope; nor did altogether depend on his grant or representation, to which Memnon had no title.

presuit Cyrillus Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 173.

in Act. 5. p. 338. & Act. 4. p. 300.

The Bishops of *Isauria* to the Emperor Leo, say, that Cyril was partaker with Pope Celestine, &c.

Dum B. Celestino incolumis Ecclesie Romanorum particeps — Part. 3. Syn. Chalc. p. 522.

Τῆς συνόδου πρῶτος ἐστίν. Eph. Act. 4. p. 338. (p. 420. & 422.)

Πρῶτος ἐστὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Act. 5. p. 347.

Ἡμεῖς οὗτοι πρῶτοι ἐσμεν. Relat. Syn. p. 406.

Ἐξαρτῶν τὸν Κωδῆκα. Relat. p. 411.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Syn. Eph.

p. 418. Cui

presuit

Cyrrillus

Syn. Chalc.

Act. 1. p. 173.

Ἡς ἡγε-  
το μαχί-  
ει Πα-  
τὴρ ἡμῶν  
Κυρίλλῳ.  
Con. Chalc.  
Act. 4.

p. 302.

Συνεδε-  
καθήμε-  
της. Cler.

Const. in

Yea it is observable that the Oriental Bishops, which with John of Antioch did oppose the Cyrillian Party in that Synod, did charge on

Ὡς ἐν ἀναρχίᾳ τοῖς καίροις καὶ πρὸς  
πάντας ἀναρχομένους —

Ἀρπάζας ἑαυτῷ τὴν αὐθεντίαν καὶ μὴτε  
παρὰ τῶν Κανόνων αὐτῷ δεδομένῳ, μήτε  
ἀπὸ τῶν ὑμῶν Διαταγμάτων, οὐμὲν

Cyril, that he, (as if he lived in a time of Anarchy) did proceed to all irregularity; and that snatching to himself the Authority, which neither was given him by the Canons, nor by the Emperors Sanctions, did

did rush on to all kind of disorder, and unlawfulness; whence it is evident, that in the judgment of those Bishops, (among whom \* were divers worthy and excellent persons) the Pope had no right to any authoritative Presidency.

This word *Presidency* indeed hath an ambiguity, apt to impose on those who do not observe it; for it may be taken for a privilege of Precedence, or for authority to govern things; the first kind of presidency the Pope without dispute, when present at a Synod, would have had among the Bishops (as being the Bishop of the first See, as the Sixth Synod calleth him; and the first of Priests, as Justinian called him) and in his absence his Legates might take up his Chair (for in General Synods each See had its Chair assigned to it, according to its order of dignity by custom.) And according to this fence the Patriarchs, and chief Metropolitans, are also often (singly or conjunctly) said to preside: as sitting in one of the first Chairs.

But the other kind of Presidency was (as those Bishops in their complaint against Cyril do imply, and as we shall See in practice) disposed by the Emperor, as he saw reason; although usually it was conferred on him, who among those present, in dignity did precede the rest: This is that authority, *αὐθεντία*, which the Syrian Bishops complained against Cyril for assuming to himself, without the Emperor's Warrant and whereof we have a notable Instance in the next General Synod at Ephesus. For,

In the Second Ephesine Synod, (which in design was a General Synod, lawfully convened, for a publick cause of determining truth, and settling peace in the Church; but which by some miscarriages proved abortive:) although the Pope had his Legates there, yet by the Emperor's order Dioscorus Bishop of Alexandria did preside, *We* (said Theodosius in his Epistle to him) *do also commit to thy godliness the authority, and the preeminency of all things appertaining to the Synod now assembled; and in the Synod of Chalcedon it is said of him, that he had received the authority of all affairs, and of judgment; and Pope Leo I. in this Epistle to the Emperor saith, that Dioscorus did challenge to himself the principal place; (insinuating a complaint, that Dioscorus should be preferred before him, although not openly contesting his right.)*

The Emperor had indeed some reason not to commit the Presidency to Pope Leo, because he was looked upon as prejudiced in the cause, having declared in favour of Flavianus, against Eutyches; whence Eutyches declined his Legate's intersting in the judgment of his cause, saying, *they were suspected to him, because they were entertained by Flavianus with great regard.* And Dioscorus, being Bishop of the next See, was taken for more indifferent, and otherwise (however afterward it proved) of much integrity and moderation; *He did* (saith the Emperor) *shine by the Grace of God, both in honesty of life, and orthodoxy of faith; and Theodoret himself, before those differences arose, doth say of him, that he was*

αὐτὸς τῶν ἁγίων ἀπαθείας καὶ ἀγαθότητος. Relat. ad Imper. Act. Eph. p. 380.

\* The Bishops of Syria being then the most learned in the World; as John of Antioch doth imply. p. 377.

Πρωτοῦ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν. Syn. 6. p. 285.

Τῶν τε Συνόδων αὐτὴ μετ' αὐτῶν ἀγνώριον Πατριάρχων. Ibid. p. 297.

Πρωτὸν ἱερέων. Justin Cod. Tit. 1.

Καὶ μὲν (οὐκ ἔστι) καὶ ἡμεῖς Ἐπίσκοποι τῶν πολλῶν Λεόντων, ὅς τ' ἀρεσκύντες Ῥώμης Ἐπίσκοπος. Evag. 1. 10.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη παλαιὰ καὶ ἀντικείμενη τῇ νῦν Συνεδριάζουσῃ συνέδριον ἡ αὐθεντία, καὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα τῇ σὴν ἀρεσκείᾳ παρέχουσι. Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 59.

Τὴν ἐξουσίαν πάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν καὶ κείσεως. Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 160.

Ἡς ἕχαρτο καθεστῆναι Διόσκορος. Evag. 1. 10.

— Si is qui sibi locum principalem vindicabat, Sacerdotalem moderationem custodire voluisset — Leo I. Ep. 25, 26, &c.

\* Τποπτοί μοι γάρνασι, &c. Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 80.

Bishop of the next See, was taken for more indifferent, and otherwise a person (however af-

— τῇ σὴ ἀγωνίᾳ ἐλαυτέρῃ διὰ τὴν σὴ Θεοῦ χάριν ὅτι τῇ σὴ βίᾳ συμμέτῃ, καὶ τῇ ὁρθότητι πιστῇ. Theod. Ep. ad Dioc. in Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 59.

Πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλοις εἰδέναι ἀρετῆς κο-  
σμεῖσθαι καὶ σώῃ ἀγωνοῦναι ἀλλομῶν—καὶ ἡ-  
μισυ ὁ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ τῷ φρονήματι μέ-  
γετον. Theod. Ep. 60.

It is true, that the

*Ecclesie Romanae Diaconi, vices habentes P. Leonis assidere non passi sunt, eo quod non data fuerit professio sanctae Sedi eorum. Liber cap. 12.*

Πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας—ἡ δὲ ἡμεῖς Θεῷ δόλον-  
τες Κύριον καὶ Ἀνατόλιον πατρὸν ἐχόντων  
ἔτοις πάντων ἐταξεν καὶ μακάριον Φλαυιανόν.  
Syn. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 62.

Legates of Pope Leo did take in dudgeon this preferment of Dioscorus; and (if we may give credence to Liberatus) would not sit down in the Synod, because the profession was not given to their Holy See; and afterwards in the Synod of Chalcedon the Pope's Legate Paschasius (together with other Bishops) did complain, that Dioscorus was preferred before the Bishop of Constantinople; but notwithstanding those ineffectual mutinies, the Emperor's will did take place, and according thereto Dioscorus had, (although he did not use it so wisely and justly as he should) the chief managery of things.

It is to be observed, that to other chief Bishops the Presidency in that Synod is also ascribed, by virtue of the Emperor's appointment; Let

Οἱ ἐπὶ λαβέσθαι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, οἷς ἡ αὐθεν-  
τία τῷ τῷ πατριάρχῳ ἐδόθη τῆς βασιλικῆς  
ἐκείνου κορυφῆς, ἀρχιεπισκοπῶν. — Syn. Chalc.  
Act. 1. p. 65.

τῶν αὐτῶν, οἷς ἡ ἐξουσία τῷ δικαζέον ἐδόθη  
το— Ibid. p. 77.

Τὸς ἐξουσίαν ἐλκυστάς, καὶ ὑπερρεχόντας τὸ  
τότε πᾶσι— Act. 2. p. 202. & Act. 4.  
p. 288. (Evang. 2 & 4.)

Κοινῆς ἀποδείξεως φανῆς πᾶσι τῶν ἐκ  
ἐκκλησιαστικῆς καὶ ὑμῶν τῶν πατριάρχων  
ἵστων— Ibid. p. 70.

*Siquidem penē omnes, qui in consen-  
sum, Praesidentium aut traducti fuerant,  
aut coacti. Leo. Ep. 51.*

*Ibi Primates Synodi nec resistentibus,  
&c. P. Leo. I. Ep.*

Whence it appeareth, that at that time according to common opinion and practice, authoritative Presidency was not affixed to the Roman Chair.

*In his fratribus — me Synodo vestra  
fraternitas existimet praesidere. P. Leo. I.  
Ep. 47.*

ὅτι οὐ γὰρ ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμόνδεις, ἐν  
ταῖς καὶ σώῃ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.  
Epist. ad Leon. p. 473.

themselves did in effect declare to the world) should do so; having so favourable a time, by the misbehaviour of Dioscorus and his adherents; against whom the Clergy of Constantinople, and other Fathers of the Synod, being incensed, were ready to comply with Leo (who had been the Champion and Patron of their Cause) in allowing him extraordinary respect, and whatever advantages he could pretend to.

Yet in effect the Emperor by his Commissioners did preside there; they propounding and allowing matters to be discussed; moderating debates by their interlocution and driving them to an issue; maintaining order and quiet in proceedings; performing those things, which the Pope's Legates at Trent, or elsewhere in the height of his power did undertake.

To them supplicatory addresses were made for succour and redress by

Καὶ δόξατε τὰς δεήσεις τὰς ἡμῶν ἀνα-  
γνώσκοντες. Act. 1. p. 50.

persons needing it; (as for instance) Command (said Eusebius of Dorylaeum) that my supplications may be read.

Of



Of them leave is requested for time to deliberate; *Command* (saith Atticus in behalf of other Bishops) *that respite be given, so that within a few days, with a calm mind, and undisturbed reason, those things may be formed which shall be pleasing to God and the Holy Fathers.*

Accordingly they order the time for consultation; *Let* (saith they) *the hearing be deferred for five days, that in the mean time your Holiness may meet at the house of the most Holy Archbishop Anatolius, and deliberate in common about the faith, that the doubtful may be instructed.*

They were acknowledged Judges; and had thanks given them for the issue by persons concerned; *I* (saith Eudomius Bishop of Nicomedia) *do thank your Honour for your right judgment.* And in the cause between Stephanus and Bassianus concerning their title to the Bishoprick of Ephesus; they having declared their sense, *the Holy Synod cryed this is right judgment; Christ hath decided the case, God judgeth by you:* And in the result, upon their declaring their opinion; *the whole Synod exclaimed, This is a right judgment, this is a pious order.*

When the Bishops, transported with eagerness and passion, did tumultuously clamour, they gravely did check them, saying, *These vulgar exclamations neither become Bishops, nor shall advantage the parties.*

In the great contest about the privileges of the Constantinopolitan See, they did arbitrate and decide the matter, even against the sense and endeavours of the Pope's Legates; the whole Synod concurring with them in these acclamations; *this is a right sentence, we all say these things, these things please us all, things are duly ordered; let the things ordered be held.*

The Pope's Legates themselves did avow this authority in them; for, *If* (saith Paschasius, in the case of the Egyptian Bishops) *your authority doth command, and ye injoin that somewhat of humanity be granted to them, &c.*

And in another case, *If*, said the Bishops, *supplying the place of the Apostolical See, your Honours do command, we have an information to suggest.*

Neither is the Presidency of these Roman Legates expressed in the Conciliar Acts; but they are barely said \*συνελθεῖν (to concur) and † συνεδρεῖν \* *Att. 5.* (to sit together) with the other Fathers; and accordingly although they *Att. 7.* sometimes talked high, yet it is not observable that they did much there; *Att. 8.* their Presidency was nothing like that at Trent, and in other like Papal *Att. 9.* Synods. It may be noted, that the Emperor's Deputies are always named *Att. 11.* in the first place, at the entrance of the Acts, before the Pope's Legates, † *Att. 13. 14.* so that they who directed the Notaries were not Popish. In effect the Em- *(p. 230.)* peror was President, though not as a Judge of Spiritual matters, yet as an Orderer of the Conciliar transactions; as the Synod doth report it to Leo; *the faithful Emperors* (saith they) *did preside, (or govern it) for good order sake.*

Καὶ ὁπότε ἐκδοθῇαι ἡμῖν, ὥς ἐν τῷ ἐκδοθῇαι ἡμῶν ἀκρωμένῳ διανοίᾳ καὶ ἀπαρεχῶν λογισμῶν τὰ τῷ Θεῷ δίκαια καὶ τοῖς ἀγίοις πατέραςι τυποθῆναι. *Att. 1. p. 219.*

Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ ἀρετὴ ἐως ἡμῶν πέντε, ὥς ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ (μεταξὺ τῶν ὑμετέρων ἀκρωμένων εἰς τὸ τὰ ἀκατάστατα Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀνατολίου, καὶ κοινῶς πρὸς τὴν πρὸς βασιλεὺς, ἵνα οἱ ἀμφιβόλοις διακαθίσταται. *Att. 4. p. 289.*

Εὐχαριστῶ τῇ δικαιοκρίσει τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας ὑμῶν. *Att. 13. p. 420.*

Ἡ ἀγία συνodus ἐδόκουν, αὐτὴ δίκαια κρίσις. ὁ Χριστὸς ἐδίκησεν τὴν ὑποχρίσιν, ὁ Θεὸς δὲ ὑμῶν δικάζει. *Att. 12. p. 409.*

Πᾶσα ἡ ἀγία συνodus ἐδόκουν, αὐτὴ δίκαια κρίσις, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ πᾶς. *Ibid. p. 414.*

Αἱ ἐκδοσεις αἱ δημοτικαὶ ὥς Ἐπισκόποις πρέπειν, ὥς τὰ μέρη ἀφελίσουσιν. *Att. 1. p. 55.*

— καὶ τῷ συνοδικῷ ἐκκυρώσασθαι ψήφον. *Syn. Chal. ad Leon. Ep. p. 475.*

Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι Ἐπίσκοποι ἐδόκουν, αὐτὴ δίκαια ψήφισις, ταῦτα πάντες λέγουμεν, ταῦτα πάντες ἀρεσκί, πάντα δυνάτως ἐτυπώθη, τὰ τυπωθέντα κρατήσω. *Att. 16. p. 464.*

Εἰ περὶ αὐτῆς ἡ ὑμετέρα ὕψιστος, καὶ καλὴ ἐστὶν ἡ πρὸς αὐτῆς ἐπαγγελθῆναι φιλανδραπίας ἐχρόμην. — *Att. 4. p. 315.*

Οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι Ἐπίσκοποι ἐπέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς θρόνου ἔπον ἐπερὶ αὐτῆς ἡ ὑμετέρα μεγαλειότης, ἐχρόμην διδασκαλίαν ὑποβαλεῖν. *Att. 16. p. 451.*

Βασιλεὺς ὁ πρὸς πρὸς ἐκκοσμίαν ὁζήσας. *Relat. Syn. ad Leon. 473.*

In the Fifth General Synod, Pope *Vigilius* indeed was moved to be present, and (in his way) to preside; but he out of state or policy declined it; wherefore the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was the Ecclesiastical President, as in the beginning of every Collation doth appear; whence clearly we may infer that the Pope's Presidency is no-wise necessary to the being of a General Council.

*Idem petimus Presidentem nobis vestra beatitudine, sub tranquillitate, & mansuetudine Sacerdotali, sanctis propositis Evangelicis, communi tractatu, &c. Coll. 1. p. 212. (E in Const. Vigil.)*

*Προεδρεύοντι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ βασιλέως, Κωνσταντίνῳ, &c.*

In the Sixth General Synod the Emperor in each Act is expressly said to preside, in Person or by his Deputies; although P. *Agatho* had his Legats there.

In the Synod of *Constance* sometimes the Cardinal of *Cambray* sometimes of *Hostia* did preside (by order of the Synod it self) and some-

*Dominus Rom. Rex indutus vestibus Regalibus recessit de Sede sua solita, & transiit ad aliam Sedem positam in fronte Altaris, tanquam Præfident pro tunc in Concilio. Syn. Const. Sess. 14. (p. 1044)*

time the King of the *Romans* did supply that place; so little essential was the Pope's Presidency to a Council deemed even then, when Papal Authority had mounted to so high a pitch.

Nor is there good reason why the Pope should have this privilege, or why this Prerogative should be affixed to any one See; so that (if there be cause; as if the Pope be unfit, or less fit; if Princes, or the Church cannot confide in him; if he be suspected of prejudice or partiality: if he be party in causes or controversies to be decided; if he do himself need correction) Princes may not assign, or the Church with allowance of Princes may not chuse any other President, more proper in their judgment for that charge; in such cases the publick welfare of Church and State is to be regarded.

Were an Erroneous Pope (as *Vigilius* or *Honorius*) fit to govern a Council, gathered to consult about defining Truth in the matter of their Error.

Were a Lewd Pope (as *Alexander VI.* *John XII.* *Paul III.* innumerable such, scandalously vicious) worthy to preside in a Synod convoca- ted to prescribe strict Laws of Reformation?

Were a Furious, Pugnacious Pope (as *Julius II.* —) apt to moderate an Assembly drawn together for settlement of Peace?

Were a Pope engaged in Schism (as many have been) a proper Moderator of a Council, design'd to suppress Schism?

Were a *Gregory VII.* or an *Innocent IV.* or a *Boniface VIII.* an allowable manager any where of Controversies about the Papal Authority?

Were now indeed any Pope fit to preside in any Council wherein the Reformation of the Church is concerned, it being notorious that Popes as such do most need Reformation, that they are the great obstructors of it, that all Christendom hath a long time a Controversie with them for their detaining it in bondage?

In this and many other cases we may reject their Presidency, as implying iniquity; according to the Rule of an old Pope; *I would know of*

*Quæro tamen ab his, judicium quod præcendunt, ubinam possit agitari, an apud ipsos, ut iidem sint inimici, & testes, & iudices? Sed tali iudicio nec humana debent committi negotia, nedum divina legis integritas. P. Gel. Ep. 4.*

*them where they would have that judgment they pretend, examin'd, what by themselves, that the same may be Adversaries, Witnesses and Judges? to such judgment as this even humane affairs are not to be trusted, much less the integrity of the divine Law.*

It is not reasonable that any person should have such a Prerogative which would be an engine of mischief: for thereby (bearing sway in general Assemblies of Bishops) he would be enabled and irresistibly tempted to domineer over the World, to abuse Princes, and disturb States

States; to oppress and enslave the Church; to obstruct all Reformation; to enact Laws; to promote and establish Errors serviceable to his Interest; the which effects of such power exercised by him in the Synod of Trent, and in divers other of the later General Synods, experience hath declared.

III. If the Pope were Sovereign of the Church, the Legislative power wholly or in part would belong to him; so far at least, that no Synod, or Ecclesiastical Consistory could without his consent determine or prescribe any thing; His approbation would be required to give life and validity to their Decrees; He should at least have a negative, so that nothing might pass against his will: This is a most essential ingredient of Sovereignty; and is therefore claimed by the Pope, who long hath pretended that no Decrees of Synods are valid without his consent, and confirmation.

*But the Decrees made by the Holy Popes, of the chief See of the Roman Church, by whose authority and sanction all Synods and holy Councils are strengthened and established, why do you say, that you do not receive and observe them.*

*Lastly, as you know nothing is accounted valid or to be receiv'd in universal Councils but what the See of Saint Peter has approv'd: so on the other side whatever she alone has rejected that only is rejected.*

*We never read of any Synod that was valid, unless it were confirm'd by the Apostolick Authority.*

*We trust no true Christian is now ignorant that no See is above all the rest more oblig'd to observe the Constitution of each Council which the consent of the universal Church hath approv'd, than the prime See which by its authority confirms every Synod, and by continued moderating preserves them according to its principality, &c.*

But this pretence, as it hath no ground in the Divine Law, or in any old Canon, or in primitive Custom; so it doth cross the sentiments and practice of Antiquity; for that in ancient Synods divers things were ordained without the Pope's consent, divers things against his pleasure.

What particular or formal confirmation did Saint Peter yield to the Assembly at Jerusalem?

That in some of the first General Synods he was not apprehended to have any negative voice, is by the very tenour and air of things, or by the little regard expressed toward him, sufficiently clear. There is not in the Synodical Epistles of Nice, or of Sardica any mention of his confirmation.

Interpretatively all those Decrees may be supposed to pass without his consent, which do thwart these pretences; for if these are now good, then of old they were known and admitted for such; and being such we cannot suppose the Pope willingly to have consented in derogation to them.

Wherefore the Nicene Canons establishing Ecclesiastical administrations without regard to him, and in authority equalling other Metropolitans with him, may be supposed to pass without his consent.

*Decretalia autem, quæ à sanctis Pontificibus primæ Sedis Romanæ Ecclesiæ sunt instituta, cujus auctoritate atque sanctione omnes Synodi, & sancta Concilia roborantur, & stabilitatem sumunt, cur vos non habere, vel observare dicitis? Papa Nic. I. Ep. 6. (ad Photium)*

*Denique ut in universalibus Conciliis, quid ratum vel quid prorsus acceptum nisi quod Sedes B. Petri probavit (ut ipsi scitis) habetur; sicut è contrario quod ipsa sola reprobat, hoc solummodo consistat hæcenus reprobaturum. P. Nich. I. Ep. 7.*

*— Nulla unquam Synodus rata legitur, quæ Apostolicæ auctoritate non fuerit fulta. P. Pelag. II. Ep. 8. (Dist. 17.)*

*Confidimus quod nullus jam veraciter Christianus ignoret uniuscujusque Synodi constitutum, quod universalis Ecclesiæ probavit assensus, non aliquam magis exequi Sedem præ cæteris oportere, quam primam; quæ & unamquamque Synodum sua auctoritate confirmat, & continuatâ moderatione custodit, pro suo scilicet principatu, &c. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13. (ad Episc. Dard.) vid. p. 647. tract. de Anath.*

*God hath promised to bless particular Synods. Matt. 18. 19.*



*Persuasioni tuæ in nullo penitus suffragatur, quorundam Episcoporum ante 60, ut jactas, annos, nunquamque à prædecessoribus tuis ad Apostolicæ Sedis transmissa notitiam.*—Leo Ep. 53. (ad Anat.) Conc.

Constant. Can. 3.

Concil. Chalce. Can. 9, 17, 28. Syn. Trull. Can. 36.

Rome, may, as plainly contrary to his interest and spirit, be supposed to pass without his consent: And so divers Popes have affirmed; if we may believe Pope Leo, (as I suppose) the Canons of the Second Council were not transmitted to Rome, they did therefore pass, and obtain in practice of the Catholick Church, without its consent or knowledge.

*Romana autem Ecclesia cōsacm Canones vel gesta Synodi illius hactenus non habet nec accipit; in hoc autem eandem Synodum accepit quod est per eam contra Macedonium definitum.* P. Greg. M Ep. 6. 31.

The same Pope Leo I. doth affirm Ep. 53.

*—ejus civitatis quæ non solum inter Sedes numeratur, sed nec inter Metropolitanorum jura censetur.* Eccl. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13 (ad Ep. Dard.)

Church and its peace? (Such was the humour of that See, to allow nothing which did not suite with the interest of its Ambition.

But farther, divers Synodical Decrees did pass expressly against the Pope's mind and will: I pass over those at Tyre, at Antioch, at Ariminum, at Constantinople, in divers places of the East, (the which do yet evince that commonly there was no such Opinion entertain'd of this privilege belonging to the Pope) and shall instance only in General Synods.

In the Synod of Chalcedon equal privileges were assigned to the Bishop of Constantinople, as the Bishop of Rome had; this with a general concurrence was decreed and subscribed, although the Pope's Legates did earnestly resist, clamour and protest against it; The Imperial Commissioners, and all the Bishops not understanding, or not allowing the Pope's negative voice.

(*in fine Actorum.* p. 464.) Inde enim fratres nostri, ab Apostolica Sede cirecti qui vice meâ Synodo præsidebant, probabiliter atque constanter illis ausibus obstiterunt, aperte reclamantes. Eccl. Leo I. Ep. 53, 54.

Οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Ἐπίσκοποι ἐβόησαν, ὡς εἰς ἐναγχαλίδην. (Act. 16. p. 469. against P. Leo's assertion, that the consent was extorted)

Τὸ ἐκ πολλῶν χρητῶν ἐστὶν—χρὶ συνοδικῶς ἐκρωσάμεθα ψῆφον, (say the Fathers to Pope Leo p. 475.) By a Synodical vote we have confirmed this ancient Custom.

And whereas Pope Leo (moved with a jealousy, that he who thus had obtained an equal rank with him, should aspire to get above him) did Ep. 53, 54, fiercely dispute, exclaim, inveigh, menace against this Order, striving to 55, 61, 62, defeat it, pretending to annul it, labouring to depress the Bishop of Constantinople from that degree, which both himself, and his Legates in the Synod had acknowledged due to him: In which endeavour divers

Εὐσεβίου Ἐπίσκοπος Δορυλαίου εἶπεν ἐκὼν ὑπέγραψα· ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ Καθολικὴ Σύνοδος τῶ ἀμωτάτῳ Πάπῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐξ ἀνέγκων, παρόντων κληρικῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἐπέθηκετο αὐτῷ. Syn. Chalce. Act. 16. (p. 462.) supra.

of his Successors did imitate him: Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaum, said, *I have willingly subscrib'd, because I have read this Canon to the most holy Pope of Rome, the Clergy of Constantinople being present, and he receiv'd it.*

Yet could not he or they accomplish their design; the veneration of that Synod and consent of Christendom overbearing their opposition; the Bishop of Constantinople sitting in all the succeeding General Synods in the second place, without any contrast; so that at length Popes were fain to acquiesce in the Bishop of Constantinople's possession of the second place in dignity among the Patriarchs.

In

In the Fifth General Synod Pope *Vigilius* did make a Constitution, *Eum* (Theodorum) in most express terms prohibiting the condemnation of the *three Chapters* (as they are called) and the anathematization of persons deceased in peace of the Church; *We dare not our selves*, says he, *condemn Theodorus*, neither do we yield to have him condemn'd by any other; and in the same Constitution he orders and decrees, *That nothing be said or done by any to the injury or discredit of Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus, a Man most approv'd in the Synod of Chalcedon; and the same*, says he, *have the Decrees of the Apostolical See determined, that no man pass a new judgment upon persons dead, but leave them as death found them.* Lastly by that Constitution he specially provides that (as he had before said) nothing might be derogated from persons dying in the Peace and Communion of the Universal Church, by his condemning that perverse opinion.

*juriam atque oblationem probatissimi in Chalcedonensi Synodo viri, hoc est Theodoret Episcopi Cyri, sub taxatione nominis ejus à quoquam fieri vel proferri. Ibid.*

*Idemque regulariter Apostolicæ Sedis à finium constituta, nulli licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare personis; sed in hoc relinqui, in quo unumquemque supremus dies invenit. —*

*Hac præsentis Constitutionis dispositione quàm maximè providemus, ne (sicut supra diximus) personis, quæ in pace & communione universalis Ecclesiæ quieverunt, sub hac damnari à nobis perversi dogmatis occasione aliquid derogetur. Ibid.*

Yet did the Synod (in smart terms reflecting on the Pope, and giving him the lye, not regarding his opinion or authority) decree, that persons deceased were liable to be anathematized; they did anathematize *Theodorus*, they did expressly condemn each of the *Chapters*; they threatened deposition or excommunication on whoever should oppose their Constitutions; \* they anathematize whoever doth not anathematize *Theodorus*.

*His gloriantes dicebant non oportere eum post mortem anathematizare — qui hæc dicunt nullam curam Dei judicatorum faciunt, nec Apostolicarum pronuntiationum, nec paternarum traditionum. Coll. 8. p. 289.*

*Condemnamus autem & anathematizamus unà cum omnibus aliis hæreticis & Theodorum. Coll. 8. p. 291.*

*Quod dicitur à quibusdam quid in communicatione & pace, defunctus est Theodorus, mendacium est, & calumnia magis adversus Ecclesiam. Coll. 5. p. 250.*

*Si quis conatus fuerit contra hæc quæ præ dictis disposuimus, vel tradere, vel docere, vel scribere, siquidem Episcopus vel Clericus sit iste tanquam aliena à Sacerdotibus & statu Ecclesiastico faciens, denudabitur Episcopatu vel Clericatu: si autem Monachus vel Laicus sit, anathematizabitur. (Coll. 8. p. 293.)*

\* Si quis defendit — & non anathematizat eum — anathema sit. Ibid.

But Pope *Vigilius* did refuse to approve their Doctrine and Sentence; — and therefore (which was the case of many other Bishops, \* as *Baronius* himself doth confess and argue) was driven into banishment; wherein he did expire.

*do) pariter sententia dicta. Baron. Ann. 553. § 219 Non consentientes depositi in exilium missi sunt. Lib. cap. 24. \* Baron. Ann. 553. § 223.*

Yet Posterity hath embraced this Synod as a legitimate and valid General Synod; and the Popes following did profess the highest reverence thereto, equally with the preceding General Synods: so little necessary is the Pope's consent or concurrence to the validity of Synodical definitions.

Upon this *Baronius* hath an admirable reflexion: *Here say* (saith he) *O Reader, and consider the matter attently* (Ay, do so I pray) *That it is no new thing, that some Synod, in which the Pope was not even present by his Legates, but did oppose it, should yet obtain the title of an Oecumenical Synod; whenas afterward the Pope's will did come in, that it should obtain such a title.*

*Greg. Ep. 1. 24. Quinam quoque Synodum pariter veneror, &c. 1. 24.*

*Pelag. II. Ep. —*

*Agatho. Syn. 6. Act. 4.*

*Leo. Syn. 6. Act. 18.*

*Hadrian. ad Nectar.*

*Hic siste, Lector, atque rem attentè considera; non esse hoc novum, ut aliqua Synodus, cui nec per Legatos ipse Pontifex interfuerit, sed adversatus fuerit, titulum tamen obtinuerit Oecumenicæ, cum postea ut hujusmodi titulum obtineret, Romani Pontificis voluntas accessit. Baron. Ann. 553. § 224.*

So in the opinion of this Doctor, the Pope can easily change the nature of things, and make that become a General Synod which once

*Si ad numeros omnes, &c.*  
Plene consenties ipsam non Oecumenicam  
tantum, sed nec private Synodi mereri  
nomen. Id. Ann. 553. § 219.

Can. 2, 7. The Canons of the Sixth General Council, exhibited by the *Trullane*  
13, 36, 55, (or *Quinisext*) Synod clearly and expressly do condemn several Doctrines  
58, 67. and Practices of Rome; I ask whether the Pope did confirm them?

—in quibus diversa capitula Romana  
Ecclesie contraria scripta inerant.  
Anast. in Vit. Joh. VII.

Church; for in their General Synod (the second *Nicene*) without contradiction, one of them is alledged (out of the very original Paper,

Κανὼν τῆς ἀγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκκλησίας  
Syn. Nic. II. Act. 4. (631.)

Πρωτόπρωτος λόγος ἐστίν, ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἁγίος  
πατριάρχης. Ibid.

Τῆς ὁ αὐτῆς ἀγίας ἐκκλησίας (Synodus, καὶ  
πᾶσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ δεσφῶς ἐκφαν-  
θέντων δογματῶν παρ' αὐτῆς, καὶ τοῦ ἐκ-  
δεσφῶτος Κανὼνος ἀποδοχῆς. Act. 3.  
p. 592.

\* Ταῦτα τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῶν ὁρθοδόξων  
ἁγίων, &c. ib. (p. 363.).  
Act. 6. p. 732. (Dist. 16. cap. 5,  
&c.)

Sed hic humana fragilitate timidus hos  
nequaquam totos emendans per suprafra-  
tos Metropolitans direxit ad Principem.  
Anast. in Vit. Joh. VII.

But it may be instanced that divers Synods have asked the Pope's consent for ratification of their Decrees and Acts.

So the Fathers of the Second General Synod, having in an *Epistle* to Pope *Damasus* and the

Οἷς ὡς ἐνδοξίας καὶ χαριτικῶς παρ' ἡμῶν  
κατασκευασί καὶ ὑμῶν συγχάριεν πα-  
τριάρχῳ ἐνλαβεῖαν, τῆς πνευματικῆς με-  
σιτῶντος ἀγάπης, καὶ τοῦ κλειανῶ φέρε, &c.  
Theod. 5.9.

ἵνα ὅ γινώτε ὡς ὡς ὡς χάρις, ἡ χάρις  
ἀπὸ θεοῦ ποιοῦνται, ὡς ὡς δὲ καὶ κυ-  
ριότητος πνεύματος, πᾶσαν ὑμῶν τὴν πνευμα-  
τικὴν καὶ δύναμιν ἐννοεῖται εἰς σύστασιν  
ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν βασιλείαν τῆ  
καὶ συγκατάθεσιν. Syn. Chal. ad P. Leon. I.  
p. 476.

Τοῖς παρ' αὐτῆς δεσφῶσι (Synodus, καὶ τῇ  
ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν μακαρίων Πέτρῳ βασιλεῖ. P. Leo. II.  
Ep. (p. 306.)

To these allegations we reply, That it was indeed the manner of all Synods, (for notification of things, and promulgation of their Orders; for

was none; yea which, as it was held, did not deserve the name of any Synod at all. O the Virtue of Papal Magick! or rather O the Impudence of Papal Advocates!

they will to be sure, as they are concerned to do, answer No: and indeed Pope *Sergius*, as *Anastasius* in his Life reporteth, did refuse them; yet did they pass for legitimate in the whole

Church; for in their General Synod (the second *Nicene*) without contradiction, one of them is alledged (out of the very original Paper, wherein the Fathers had subscribed) as a *Canon*

of the Holy General Sixth Synod; and avowed for such by the Patriarch *Tarasius*, both in way of argument of defence and of profession in his *Synodical Epistle* to the Patriarchs; (where he saith,

that together with the divine Doctrines of the Sixth Synod he doth also embrace the Canons enacted by it;) of which *Epistle* Pope *Adrian* in his Answer thereto doth recite a part containing those

words, and \*applaud it for Orthodox; signifying no offence at his embracing the *Trullane* Canons. And all those 102 Canons are again

avowed by the Synod in their *Antithesis* to the Synod of *Constantinople*. In fine, if we believe *Anastasius*, Pope *John VII.* did, being timorous, out

of humane frailty direct these Canons, without amendment, by two Metropolitans, to the Emperor, that is he did admit them so as they stand.

So the Synod of *Chalcedon* did, with much respect, ask from Pope *Leo* the confirmation of its Sanctions. That you may know how that we have done nothing for favour or out of spite, but as guided by the divine direction, we have made known to you the force of all that has been done; for your concurrence and for the confirmation and approbation of the things done.

Of the Fifth Synod Pope *Leo II.* saith, ---that he agreed to what was determin'd in it, and confirms it with the authority of the Blessed Saint Peter.



for demonstration and maintenance of concord, for adding weight and authority to their determinations, for engaging all Bishops to a willing compliance in observing them, for attestation to the common interest of all Bishops in the Christian Truth, and in the governance and edification of the Church) having framed Decrees concerning the publick State, to demand in fairest terms the consent to them of all Catholick Bishops, who were absent from them, to be attested by their subscription.

So did *Constantine* recommend the *Nicene* Decrees to all Bishops, undertaking that they would assent to them.

ἔθεν καὶ εὐχαιρῶς ἀλλήλους ἐντολῶν — *de Vit. Const.* 3. 20. Καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ τῇ ὑμῶν ἐκείνῃ ἀρχιερεὶ ἀρέσκει. *ib.* 3. 19.

So (more expressly) the Synod of *Sardica*, in their Epistle to all Bishops of the Catholick Church; *Do ye also, our Brethren and Fellow-ministers, the more use diligence, as being present in spirit with our Synod, to yield consent by your subscription, that concord may be preserved every where by all the Fellow-ministers.*

So did Pope *Liberius* request of the Emperor *Constantius*, that the faith delivered at *Nice* might be confirmed by the subscription of all Bishops.

So did *Athanasius* procure a Synod at *Alexandria* to confirm the Decrees at *Sardica*, and in *Palestine* concerning him.

So the *Macedonian* Bishops are said to have authorized their Agents to ratify the faith of *Consubstantiality*.

Many such Instances occur in story, by which it may appear, that the Decrees of Synods concerning Faith, or concerning any matters of common interest were presented to all Bishops, and their consent requested or required; because, say the *Roman Clergy* in *St. Cyprian*, a decree cannot be firm which has not the consent of many.

Whence it is no wonder, if any Synods did thus proceed toward so eminent a Bishop as was he of *Rome*, that they should endeavour to give him satisfaction; that they should desire to receive satisfaction from him of his conspiring with them in Faith, of his willingness to comply in observing good Rules of Discipline; that (as every vote had force, so) the suffrage of one in so great dignity and reputation might adjoin some regard to their judgment.

The Pope's confirmation of Synods, what was it in effect but a declaration of his approbation and assent, the which did confirm by addition of Suffrage; as those who were present by their Vote, and those who were absent by their Subscription are said to confirm the Decrees of Councils; every such consent being supposed to encrease the authority; whence the number of Bishops is sometimes reckoned according to the subscriptions of Bishops absent; as the Council of *Sardica*, is sometimes related to consist of three hundred Bishops, although not two hundred were present, the rest concurring by subscription to its definitions.

Συνεδάσατε ὁ μᾶλλον καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοὶ καὶ συλλειτουργοί, ὡς τῷ πνεύματι συνόντες τῇ συνόδῳ ἡμῶν συνεπιφαινεῖσθαι δι' υπογραφῆς ὑμῶν, ὅπως τὰ πάσης πάντων τῶν πανταχοῦ συλλειτουργῶν ὁμοφωνίαν διασώζωται. *Syn. Sard. Epist. apud Athan. in Apol.* 2. p. 766.

Ἐξῆται ὁ ἦν ἐν Νικαίᾳ ἐξαδεδεσμένος πῶς υπογραφῆς ὅτι πάντων Ἐπισκόπων κατένευται. *Soz.* 4. 11.

Σύνεδον ἡνέδει παρὰ δ' αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰῶννι Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ ἐπισφραγίσαι τοῖς ἐν Σαρχιδῇ καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ ὅτι αὐτὰ διωσμένους. *Soz.* 4. 1.

Ἐπεταλάμενοι — κυρῶσαι τὸ ὁμολογεῖσθαι. *Socr.* 4. 12.

— quoniam nec firmum decretum potest esse, quod non plurimorum videbitur habere consensum. *Cler. Rom. apud Cyp. Ep.* 31.

Παρακαλεῖται τοίνυν ἡμῶν τῶν αὐτῶν φίλοις καὶ κείσιν. *Syn. Chalc. ad Leon.* p. 476.

Κατὰ τὴν συνοδικὴν ἐκτελέσειαν ἡμῶν — *Epist. Syn. Chalc. ad Leon.* p. 475.

*Socr.* 2. 20. Ὁ *Valef. Ann. ibid.*

Other

*Sententia* Other Bishops in yielding their suffrage, do express it by *I confirm, I*  
*fratrum define, I decree.*

*omnes sequimur, omnes confirmamus, omnes observandas esse decernimus.* Conc. Rom. P. Hill p. 579.

But the effectual confirmation of Synods, which gave them the force of Laws, was in other hands, and depended on the Imperial Sanction.

*Hæc itaque omnibus per diver- sa tem- ra subsecu- tis, præ- dicti pie recordati-* So *Justinian* affirmeth generally: *All these things at diverse times follow- ing, our above named Predecessors of pious memory, corroborated and confirm'd by their Laws what each Council had determin'd, and expell'd those Hereticks who attempted to resist the definitions of the aforesaid four Councils and disturb the Churches.*

*onis nostri Patres ea quæ in unoquoque Concilio judicata sunt, legibus suis corroboraverunt, & confirmaverunt; & heretici qui definitionibus prædictorum S. quatuor Conciliorum resistere, & Ecclesias conturbare conati sunt, expulerunt.* Justin. in Conc. V. Coll. 1. (p. 210.)

Τὸ παρ' ἐκείνων γραφὴν, τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν. ἐκράτους νόμῳ. Athan. apud Theod. 1. 4.

Τὸ δὲ συνέδριον ὁ γράμματι κερῶν ἐπιστολῶν. Euseb. de Vir. Const. 2. 23.

Ἰσοδὲ ἡδὺν καὶ διατάξιν ἐπέλεγε. Euf. ibid. 3. 20.

Καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς τῷ συνέδριον ἔδοξε, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπιφύσειατο. Soz. 7. 9.

Δέχμεθα τοίνυν τὸν οὗτος ἡμετέριον γράμματι τῆς οὗτος ἐπιστολῆς ἐπιμνησθῆναι τὸ συνέδριον τὸ ἵππον, ἢ ὡς παρ' τοῖς ἡμετέροις γράμματι τὸ Ἐκκλησίαν τετιμῆται, ὡς καὶ τὸ δὲ ἀντων ἐπιστολῆς τὸ τέλει. Praef. ad Can. Conc. Const. (apud Bin. p. 660.)

*Sed prædictus pie recordationis Theodosius vindicans ea, quæ ita rectè contra Nestorium, & ejus impietatem fuerant judicata, fecit firmiter obtinere contra eum factam condemnationem.* Justin. in Quinto Conc. Coll. 1.

Χρὲ δὲ πάντα καὶ τὸ τῷ Θεῷ μέλλον ἀρεσκέν ἵνα φιλοφιλίας καὶ ἀληθείας ἔξετασθῶνται ὡς τῷ Θεῷ τὸ ἡμετέρας διανοίας βεβαιωθῆναι. Epist. Theod. ad Syn. Eph. in Actis Conc. p. 375.

The other abortive Synod at Ephesus was also confirmed by Theodosius Junior, as *Dioscorus*

Ἡμεῖς τοίνυν ἐκείνῳ τὰ κεκρίμενα συνήνεκον ἡμῶν πᾶσι ἢ συνέδριον, καὶ κατέδοτο οὐκίας φωνῆς, καὶ ὑπέγραψε καὶ ἀνέχθη τῷ ἐπιστάτῳ βασιλεῖ τὸ ἴδιον ἀρχιερεὺς Θεοδοσίῳ καὶ ἐκείνῳ πάντα τὰ κεκρίμενα Θεῷ τῆς ἀγίας καὶ οὐκαὶ ἡμετέρας συνόδου νόμῳ ἡμῶν. Syn. Chal. Act. 1. p. 59.

So particularly *Constantine* (as *Athanasius* himself reporteth) did by Law confirm the decrees of the great Synod of Nice; and *Eusebius* assureth the same, He (saith he) did ratifie the decrees of the Synod by his authority; His Letters are extant, which he sent about the World exhorting and requiring all to conform to the constitutions of that Synod.

So *Theodosius* did confirm the Decrees of the Second General Synod; adding (saith *Sozomen*) his confirmatory Suffrage to their Decree; the which he did at the supplication of the Fathers, addressed to him in these terms; *We therefore do beseech your Grace, that by your pious Edict the sentence of the Synod may be authorized; that as by the Letters of convocation you did honour the assembly, so you would also confirm the result of things decreed.*

The Third General Synod was also confirmed by *Theodosius II.* as *Justinian* telleth us; The above-named *Theodosius* of pious memory, maintaining what had been so justly determined against *Nestorius* and his impiety made his condemnation valid.

And this Emperor asserted this privilege to himself, as of right and custom belonging to him; writing to the Synod in these word; *for all things, so as may please God, without contentiousness and with truth being examined ought so to be established by our religiousness.*

The other abortive Synod at Ephesus was also confirmed by *Theodosius Junior*, as *Dioscorus* in his defence alledged in these words, which shew the manner of practice in this case; *We then indeed did judge the things, which were judged; the whole Synod did accord with us, and gave verdict by their own votes, and subscribed; and they were referred to the most religious Emperor Theodosius of happy memory; and he did by a general Law confirm all things judged by the Holy and Oecumenical Synod.*

So

So also did the Emperor *Marcian* confirm the Synod of *Chalcedon*; as himself telleth us in his Royal Edict: *We* (saith he) *having by the sacred Edict of our serenity confirmed the Holy Synod, did warn all to cease from disputes about Religion: with which Pope Leo signifieth his compliance in these terms; But because by all means your piety and most religious will must be obeyed, I have willingly approv'd the Synodical Constitutions about confirming the Catholick Faith and condemning Hereticks, which pleased me.*

*Justinian* did with a witness confirm the Fifth Synod, punishing with banishment all who would not submit to its determinations.

In the Sixth Synod the Fathers did request the Emperor, according to custom, to confirm its definitions, in these very words; *To what we have determined set your Seal, your Royal ratification by writing, and confirmation of them all by your sacred Edicts and holy Constitutions according to custom.*

*We beg that by your sacred signing of it you would give force to what we have defined and subscribed.*

*We intreat the power of our Lord guided by God's wisdom to confirm, for the great strength and security of the Orthodox Faith, the copies of our determination read in the hearing of your most serene Majesty, and subscribed by us, that they may be delivered to the five Patriarchal Sees with your pious confirmation.*

Accordingly he did confirm that Synod by his Edict; *All these things being thus ordered by this Sixth Holy and Oecumenical Synod; We decree that none whosoever trouble himself farther about this Faith, or advance any new inventions about it.*

So he told Pope *Leo II.* in his Epistle to him; *This divine and venerable determination the Holy Synod has made, to which we also have subscribed, and confirmed it by our Religious Edicts, exhorting all our People who have any love for Christ, to follow the Faith there written.*

Pope *Leo* tells his name-fake *Leo* the Emperor, *That he must always remember that the Imperial power was given him not only to rule the World, but more especially to protect the Church.*

So by long prescription, commencing with the first General Synod, did the Emperor enjoy this Prerogative; and with good reason, He having an unquestionable warrant and obligation to promote the welfare of the Church, designed by those Conventions; He being the Guardian of Concord among his Subjects, and Protector of their Liberties, which might be nearly concerned in Conciliar Proceedings; the power of enacting Laws being an incommunicable branch of Sovereign Majesty; He alone having power committed to him, able to enforce the observance of Decrees, without which they would in effect signifie little.

Because

Ἱεροῦ καὶ ἡμετέρας ἡμετέρας διατάγ-  
ματι καὶ ἀγίαν βουλὴν πάντας ἐκείνους ὑπο-  
τάσσονται πάντας, ὅτι καὶ ἐκείνη ἐκείνη  
παύσασθαι διατάξων. Conc. Chal. Part.  
3. 478.

Quia vero omnibus modis obediendum  
est pietati vestrae, religiosissimeque volun-  
tati, Constitutionibus Synodalibus, quae  
mibi de confirmatione fidei Catholicae &  
haereticorum damnatione placuerunt, li-  
bens adjeci sententiam meam. P. Leo. I.  
Ep. 53. (ad Mart. Aug.)

Καὶ τὴν παρ' ἡμῶν δευτέρου σφραγίδα  
σφραγίσαι καὶ ὑμῶν ἐγγράφον βασιλικὴν ἐπι-  
κρίσιν, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων, καὶ ἡμῶν  
ἐκείνων διατάξων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ  
τῶν βουλῶν. Syn. VI. Act. 18. p. 275.

Αἰτῶμεν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν ὑποσημειώσεως  
τὸ κύριον σφραγίσαι τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐφαρ-  
μοδίον ἐντολῶν ὑμῶν. Ibid. p. 283.

Αἰτῶμεν τὸ θεόδοτον τὸ δευτέρον καὶ  
πρὸς μείζονα καὶ ἐκδοτικὴν πίστιν ἀσφαλεῖν  
τὴν καὶ βεβαίωσιν ἐκτύπων ἐντολῶν ὅπως  
καὶ ἀναγνωσθῶν καὶ παρασταθῶν καὶ ῥαλλή-  
νῃ καὶ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκδοτικῶν τῶν πᾶσι  
Πατριαρχαῖς ἐκείνοις καὶ τῶν ἐκδοτικῶν ὑμῶν  
ὑποσημειώσεως. Ibid. p. 284.

Τῶν ὅπως ἀπάντων ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγίας  
ταύτης καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς ἐκείνης συνέλευ-  
σεως, Sancimus, ὅτι μὴδὲν καὶ πάν-  
των ἐπὶ τῇ καὶ τῇ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ κα-  
νόνῃ καὶ δόγματι ἐκείνῃ, καὶ κα-  
νόνῃ, Ibid. Edict. Const. p. 294.

Θεὸν ὃ σὺν ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγία σύνοδος  
ἐκείνη, ἡ καὶ ὑμῶν ἐκείνη, καὶ δι'  
ἐκείνης ἡμῶν ἐκείνης τῆς ἐκείνης  
ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἐκείνης ἐκείνης  
ἐκείνης, Ibid. p. 298. & p. 302.

Debes incumbenter advertere Regiam  
potestatem tibi non solum ad mundi Regi-  
men, sed maxime ad Ecclesiae praesidium  
esse collatam, Sc. Leo M. Ep. 75.



Because also commonly the Decrees of Synods did in a manner re- trench some part of the Royal Prerogative, translating or imparting to others Causes before appropriate to his Jurisdiction (as in the case of Appeals, and of prohibiting Addresses to Court, ordered in the *Sardican* and other Synods; of exempting Clergymen from secular Jurisdiction, from taxes and common burthens, &c.) which ought not to be done without his licence and authority.

Ἀδύνατον γὰρ ὡς ἡγούμενα δίκαια τῶ ὑμῶν κρείττος εὐτακίας καὶ ἐνδύσεως τοῦ ὁσχευόμενα τυποῦναι. *Rel. Orient. ad imp. Aeth. Syn. Eph. p. 372*

So that the *Oriental* Bishops had good reason to tell the Emperor, that it was impossible without his authority to order the matters under consideration with good law and order.

It is no-wise reasonable that any other should have this power, it being inconsistent with publick peace that in one State there should be two Legislative powers; which might clash the one with the other, the one enacting Sanctions prejudicial to the interest and will of the other: wherefore the Pope being then a Citizen of *Rome*, and a Subject to the Emperor, could not have a Legislative power, or a negative vote in Synods, but that wholly did belong to the Imperial authority.

Τῶν δὲ Ἀριμίνων ἑαυαίτων τυύτης ἀκού- ρων ὄντων, ὡς μήτε Ῥωμαίων Ἐπισκόπων, μήτε ἑλ' ἄλλων συνθεμένων αὐτ. ἰς, καὶ ὡς πολλῶν ἑλ' αὐτοῦ συνελθόντων ἀπαρτείν- των τοῖς τότε παρ' αὐτῶν διδογμένοις. *Soz. 6. 23.*

Οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁσχευόμενα πᾶσι καὶ ἡρώδης ἡρώδης ἀπὸ τῆς ἀειδομῆς τῆς Ἀριμίνων συναχθέν- των, ὅποτε συνέστη, μήτε τῶ Ῥωμαίων Ἐπισκόπου, καὶ ὅτε πᾶσι ἔδει καὶ γνώμην ἐκδέχασθαι. ὅτε Οὐικεντίος ὅς ἐπὶ τοσούτοις ἔτεσι τῶ Ἐπισκοπῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐφύλαξεν, ὅτε τῶ ἄλλων τοῖς τοιούτοις συγκατα- μένων. — *Theod. 2. 22.*

But it is opposed, that some Synods have been declared invalid for want of the Pope's con- firmation; for to the Decrees of the Synod at *Ariminum* it was excepted, that they were null, because the Bishop of *Rome* did not consent to them: There could not (say the *Roman* Synod in *Theodoret*) be any prejudice from the number of those assembled in *Ariminum*, it being plain, that neither the *Roman* Bishop, whose suffrage ought first to have been received, nor *Vicentius*, who for so many years did hold his *Episcopacy* blameless, nor others agreeing to such things. To which exception I an- swer, that

1. That which is alledged against the Synod of *Ariminum*, is not the defect of the Pope's confirmation subsequent, but of his consent and concurrence before it, or in it; \* which is very reasonable, because he had a right to be present, and to concur in all such Assemblies, especially

\* *P. Liberius* being absent, detained from it by violence in banishment.

being so eminent a Bishop.

2. The same exception every Bishop might alledge, all having a like right and common interest to Vote in those Assemblies.
3. Accordingly the assent of other Bishops, particularly of those eminent in dignity or merit, is also alledged in exception; which had been needless, if his alone dissent had been of so very peculiar force.
4. The Emperor, and many other Bishops did not know of any peculiar necessity of his confirmation.

Again it may be objected, that Popes have voided the Decrees of General Synods, as did Pope *Leo* the Decrees of the Synod of *Chalcedon*, concerning the Privileges of the *Constantinopolitan* See, in these blunt words: But the agreements of Bishops repugnant to the Holy Canons made at *Nice*, your faith and piety joining with us, we make void, and by the authority of the Blessed Apostle Saint Peter, by a general determination we disannul; and in his Epistle

*Consensiones vero Episcoporum, Sancto- rum Canonum apud Niciam conditorum regulis repugnantes, unita nobiscum ve- stre fidei pietate, in irrium mittimus, & per auctoritatem Beati Petri Apostoli ge- neralis prorsus definitione cassamus. P. Leo I. Ep. 55. (ad Pulcher. Aug.)*

to

to those of that Synod, *For however vain conceit may arm it self with extorted compliances, and think its wilfulness sufficiently strengthened with the name of Councils: yet whatever is contrary to the Canons of the above-nam'd fathers will be weak and void.* Lastly in his Epistle to Maximus Bishop of Antioch, he says, *He has such a reverence for the Nicene Canons, that he will not permit or endure that what those holy fathers have determined be by any novelty violated.*

This behaviour of Pope Leo (although applauded and imitated by some of his Successors) I doubt not to except against in behalf of the Synod, that it was disorderly, factious and arrogant; (proceeding indeed from ambition and jealousy) the leading act of high presumption in this kind, and one of the seeds of that exorbitant ambition, which did at length overwhelm the dignity and liberty of the Christian Republick: Yet for somewhat qualifying the business it is observable, that he did ground his repugnancy and pretended annulling of that Decree (or of Decrees concerning Discipline) not so much upon his authority to cross General Synods, as upon the inviolable firmness and everlasting obligation of the Nicene Canons; the which he (although against the reason of things, and rules of Government) did presume no Synod could abrogate or alter. In fine, this opposition of his did prove ineffectual by the sense and practice of the Church, maintaining its ground against his pretence.

It is an unreasonable thing, that the opinion or humour of one man (no wiser or better commonly than others) should be preferred before the common agreement of his brethren, being of the same Office and Order with him; so that he should be able to overthrow and frustrate the result of their meetings and consultations, when it did not square to his conceit or interest; especially seeing there is not the least appearance of any right he hath to such a Privilege, grounded in Holy Scripture, Tradition or Custom; for seeing that Scripture hath not a syllable about General Synods, seeing that no Rule about them is extant in any of the first Fathers till after 300 years, seeing there was not one such Council celebrated till after that time, seeing in none of the First General Synods any such Canon was framed in favour of that Bishop, what ground of right could the Pope have to prescribe unto them, or thwart their proceedings? Far more reason there is, (in conformity to all former Rules and Practice) that he should yield to all his Brethren, than that all his Brethren should submit to him: and this we see to have been the judgment of the Church, declared by its Practice in the cases before touched.

IV. It is indeed a proper endowment of an absolute Sovereignty, immediately and immutably constituted by God, with no terms or rules limiting it, that its will declared in way of Precept, Proclamations, concerning the Sanction of Laws, the abrogation of them, the Dispensation with them, should be observed.

This Privilege therefore in a high strein the Pope challengeth to himself; asserting to his Decrees and Sentences the force and obligation of Laws; so that the body of that Canon Law, whereby he

*Quantumlibet enim extortis assentationibus se instruat vanitatis elatio, & appetitus suos Consiliorum æstimet nomini roborandos, infirmum atque irritum erit, quicquid à prædictorum Patrum Canonibus discreparis. Ep. 61. (ad Syn. Chalced.)*

*Tanta apud me est Nicenorum Canonum reverentia, ut ea quæ sunt à Sanctis Patribus constituta nec permiscrim nec patiar aliquâ novitate violari. Leo Ep. 62. (ad Max. Antioch.)*

*P. Gelas. Ep. 13. (ad Episc. Dard.) p. 642. & in Tract. de Anathem. (pag. 647.)*

*P. Pelag. II. Ep. 5. (ad Eliam.) p. 474. Greg. M. Ep.*

pretendeth to govern the Church, doth in greatest part consist of Papal Edicts, or Decretal Epistles, imitating the Rescripts of Emperours, and bearing the same force.

In *Gratian* we have these Aphorisms from Popes concerning this their Privilege.

*Nulli fas est vel velle vel posse transgredi Apostolicæ Sedis præcepta. P. Greg. IV. Dist. 19. c. 5.*

*— Quanto potius quæ ipsa (sedes Apostolica) pro Catholica fide, profanis (i. profanis) dogmatibus, pro variis & multisaribus Ecclesiæ necessitatibus & fidelium moribus diverso tempore scripsit, omni debent honore præferri, & ab omnibus prorsus in quibuslibet opportunitatibus discretionem vel dispensationem magistrâ reverenter assumi? P. Nic. I. Epist. Dist. 19. c. 1.*

*Decretales Epistolæ, quas beatissimi Papæ diversis temporibus ab urbe Roma pro diversorum Patrum consultatione decernunt, venerabiliter suscipiendas decernimus. P. Gelas. I. (in decreto) lit. à Nic. P. Ep. 42. ad Epist. Galliæ. Dist. 19. c. 1.*

*Si decreta Romanorum Pontificum non habetis, de neglectu atque incuria estis arguendi; si vero habetis & non observatis, de temeritate estis corripendi & increpandi. P. Nic. I. Ep. 6. ad Phot. Dist. 20. cap. 2.*

*Sic omnes Apostolicæ Sedis Sanctiones accipiende sunt tanquam ipsius Divini Petri voce firmate sunt. P. Agatho. Dist. 19. c. 2. Vid. Syn. VI. Act. 4. p. 35.*

*Quia in speculum, & exemplum S. Romana Ecclesiæ, cui nos Christus præesse voluit, proposita est, ab omnibus quicquid statuit, quicquid ordinat, perpetuo & irrefragabiliter observandum est. P. Steph. (Dist. 19. cap. 3.) P. Gelas. I. Ep. 9. de dispens. (p. 633.)*

*Qui secundum plenitudinem potestatis de jure possumus supra jus dispensare. P. Inn. III. Decret. Greg. Lib. 3. tit. 8. c. 4.*

*Sedes hæc — quæ singulari etiam auctoritate perficere valet, multorum sæpe sacerdotum decernit definire consensu. P. Nic. I. Ep. 18. (ad Carolum R.)*

*Leo I. Ep. 1. cap. 5. P. Hilarius in Conc. Rom. p. 578. Caus. 25. Qu. 1. cap. 4. P. Urb. Caus. 25. Qu. 1. cap. 6. P. Anast. ad Imp. Anast. P. Siric. Ep. 1. (p. 691.)*

But this power he doth assume and exercise merely upon Usurpation, and unwarrantably; having no ground for it in original right or ancient practice.

Eph 4. 5.  
Jam. 4. 12.

Originally the Church hath no other General Law-giver beside our one Lord and one Law-giver.

As to practice we may observe

\* *ἀρχαία ἔθνη.*  
Syn. Constantinop. Can. 2.

1. Anciently (before the First general Synod) the Church had no other Laws, beside the Divine Laws; or those \* which were derived from the Apostles by Traditional custom; or those which each Church did enact for it self in provincial Synods; or which were propagated from one Church to another by imitation and compliance; or which in like manner were framed and settled.

Whence according to different Traditions, or different reasons and circumstances of things, several Churches did vary in points of Order and Discipline.

The

No person ought to have either the will or the power to transgress the precepts of the Apostolick See.

— Those things which by the Apostolick See have at several times been written for the Catholick faith, for sound doctrines, for the various and manifold exigency of the Church and the manners of the faithful, how much rather ought they to be preferr'd in all honour, and by all men altogether, upon all occasions whatsoever to be reverently received?

Those Decretal Epistles which most holy Popes have at divers times given out from the City of Rome upon their being consulted with by divers Bishops, we decree that they be received with veneration.

If ye have not the Decrees of the Bishops of Rome, ye are to be accused of neglect and carelessness; but if ye have them, yet observe them not; ye are to be chidden and rebuk'd for your temerity.

All the Sanctions of the Apostolick See are so to be understood, as if confirmed by the voice of Saint Peter himself.

Because the Roman Church, over which by the will of Christ we do preside, is proposed for a mirror and example; whatsoever it doth determine, whatsoever that doth appoint is perpetually and irrefragably to be observed by all men.

We who according to the plenitude of our power have a right to dispense above Law or right.

This See — that which it might doe by its sole authority, it is often pleased to define by consent of its Priests.



The Pope then could not impose his Traditions, Laws, or Customs upon any Church; if he did attempt it, he was liable to suffer a repulse; as is notorious in the case, when Pope *Victor* would (although rather as a Doctour than as a Law-giver) have reduced the Churches of *Asia* to conform with the *Roman* in the time of celebrating *Easter*; wherein he found not onely stout resistance, but sharp reproof.

In *St. Cyprians* time every Bishop had a free power according to his discretion to govern his Church; and it was deemed a Tyrannical enterprise for one to prescribe to another, or to require obedience from his Collegues; as otherwhere by many clear allegations out of that Holy man we have shewed. For none of us (saith he) makes himself a Bishop of Bishops, or by a tyrannical terrour compels his Collegues to a necessity of obedience; since every Bishop according to the licence of his own liberty and power hath his own freedom, and can no more be judged by another than he himself can judge another.

Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendum necessitatem Collegas suos adigit; quando habet omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis & potestatis suae arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare. Cyp. in Conc. Carthag.

If any new Law were then introduced, or Rule determined for common practise, it was done by the general agreement of Bishops or of a preponderant multitude among them, to whom the rest out of modesty and peaceableness did yield compliance; according to that saying of the *Roman* Clergy to *St. Cyprian* (upon occasion of the debate concerning the manner of admitting lapsed persons to communion) that Decree cannot be valid, that hath not the consent of the major part.

Quoniam nec firmum Decretum potest esse, quod non plurimorum videtur habuisse consensum. Cler. Rom. ad Cyp. (Epist. 31.)

The whole validity of such Laws or Rules did indeed wholly stand upon presumption of such consent; whereby the common liberty and interest was secured.

2. After that by the Emperours Conversion the Church enjoying secular protection and encouragement, did reduce it self as into a closer union and freer communication of parts, so into a greater uniformity of practise; especially by means of great Synods, wherein (the Governours and Representatives of all Churches being called unto them and presumed to concur in them) were ordained Sanctions, taken to oblige all. The Pope had indeed a greater stroke than formerly, as having the first place in order, or privilege of honour in Ecclesiastical Assemblies, where he did concur; yet had no casting vote, or real advantage above others: all things passing by majority of Vote: This is supposed as notorious in the acts of the Fifth Council: This (say they) is a thing to be granted, that in Councils we must not regard the interlocution of one or two, but those things which are commonly defined by all, or by the most

Idem enim omnes credimus operati, in quo deprehendimus eadem omnes censuram & disciplinam consensione sociati. Cler. Rom. ad Cyp. Ep. 31.

Illud certe constituto, quod in conciliis non unus vel secundus interlocutionem attendere oportet, sed haec quae communiter ab omnibus vel amplioribus definiuntur. Concil. 5. Collat. 6. p. 263.

So also in the Fifth Council, *George* Bishop of *Constantinople* saith, that seeing every where the Council of the multitude, or of the most doth prevail, it is necessary to anathematize the persons before mentioned.

Ἐπειδὴ τὸ πλῆθος ὅπου ἔστι πλεονέχον πανταχῶς ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ἐκείνη ἀναγκάζει ὅτι ἐνομοσὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἐκείνου ἀναθηματίζονται. Pl. Syn. Act. 16. p. 149.

3. Metropolitan Bishops in their Provinces had far more power, and more surely grounded, than the Pope had in the whole Church (for the Metropolitans had an unquestioned authority, settled by cus-

Καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τὴν  
ἐκείνην Σύ-  
νον. Conc.  
Nic. Can. 6.

tome, and confirmed by Synodical Decrees) yet had not they a negative voice in Synodical debates: for it is decreed in the *Nicene Synod*, that in the designation of Bishops (which was the principal affair in Ecclesiastical administrations) *plurality of votes should prevail*.

It is indeed there said, that none should be ordained *χωρὶς γνώμης, without the opinion of the Metropolitan*; but that doth not import a negative voice in him, but that the transaction should not pass in his absence, or without his knowledge, advice and suffrage: for so the Apostolical Canon (to which the *Nicene Fathers* there did allude and refer, meaning to interpret it) doth appoint that the *Metropolitan* should *doe nothing ἀνεὺ τῶν πάντων γνώμης, without the opinion of all*, that is without suffrage of the most, concluding all; (for surely that Canon doth not give to each one a negative voice) And so the Synod of *Antioch* (held soon after that

Κατὰ κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν, ἀλλὰ  
μὴδὲ ἀνεὺ τῶν πάντων γνώμης  
ποιεῖται τ. Αρσ. Can. 34.

Ἐστὶν μὲν ἡ ἐκείνη δὲ ἡ ἀ-  
πόστολος, καὶ ποιεῖται ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει τῇ  
ἐκείνῃ. Syn. Ant. Can. 19.

— κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἴσως.  
ibid.  
Καὶ εἴπω ἡ ἐκείνη ἀκρίβειαν. Syn.  
Nic. Can. 6.

of *Nice*, which therefore knew best the sense of the *Nicene Fathers*, and how the custome went) doth intetpret it, decreeing, that a *Bishop* should not be ordained without a Synod, and the presence of the *Metropolitan of the Province*; in which Synod yet they determine, that *plurality of votes should carry it*; no peculiar advantage in the case being granted to the *Metropolitan*.

Seeing therefore Provincial Synods were more ancient than General, and gave pattern to them; if we did grant the same Privilege to the Pope in General Synods, as the *Metropolitans* had in Provincial (which yet we cannot doe with any good reason or ground) yet could not the Pope thence pretend to an authority of making Laws by himself.

4. It was then a passable opinion, that *He* as one was in reason obliged to yield to the common judgment of his Collegues and Brethren; as the Emperour *Constantius* told Pope *Liberius*, that *the vote of the plurality of Bishops ought to prevail*.

Τῶν γὰρ πλείονων Ἐπισκόπων ἡ ψήφος  
ἰσχυρὴν ὀρεῖται. Theod. 2. 16.

5. When Pope *Julius* did seem to cross a rule of the Church, by communicating with persons condemned by Synods, the Fathers of *Antioch* did smartly recriminate against him, shewing that were not to receive Canons from him.

Γνώμη καὶ τὴν ἀποδοτέον δὲ ἐκείνῃ  
ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ, ἀλλὰ μὴ δὲ  
καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ. Socr. 2. 15.

6. So far was the Pope from prescribing Laws to others, that he was looked upon as subject to the Laws of the Church no less than others; as the *Antiochene Fathers* did suppose, complaining to Pope *Julius* of his transgressing the Canons; the which charge he doth not repell by pretending exemption, but by declaring that he had not offended against the Canons, and retorting the accusation against themselves; as the *African* Eathers supposed, when they told Pope *Celestine*, that he could not admit persons to communion, which had been excommunicated by them, that being contrary to a Decree of the *Nicene Synod*; as the *Roman Church* supposed it self, when it told *Marcian* that they could not receive him without leave of his Father who

Ἰούλιος ὡς ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ  
ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ. P. Julii Epist. apud  
Athanasi. in Apol. 2. p. 748.

Τινὲς εἰσὶν οἱ ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ  
ἐκείνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνῃ. p. 748.

Μηδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν Σπυριδωνίου, &c.  
Epist. ad P. Celest. 1.

Ὁ δὲ Πατριάρχης αὐτῷ τὸ ἐπιτελεῖν  
τὴν ἐκείνῃ. Epiph.  
Her. 43.

who had rejected him: This the whole tenour of Ecclesiastical Canons sheweth, they running in a general style, never excepting the Pope from the Laws prescribed to other Bishops.

7. The privilege of dispensing with Laws had then been a strange hearing, when the Pope could in no case dispense with himself for infringing them, without bringing clamour and censure upon him.

*versæ pacis tranquillitas non aliter poterit custodiri, nisi sua Canonibus reverentia intemerata servetur.* P. Leo I. Ep. 62.

The Tranquility of an universal peace cannot otherwise be kept, unless due reverence be paid to the Canons.

8. It had indeed been a vain thing for Synods with so much trouble and solemnity to assemble, if the Pope without them could have framed Laws, or could with a puff of his mouth have blown away the results of them by dispensation.

9. Even in the growth of *Papal Dominion*, and after that the Seeds of *Roman ambition* had sprouted forth to a great bulk, yet had not Popes the heart or face openly to challenge power over the universal Canons, or exemption from them; but pretended to be the chief observers, guardians, defenders, and executors of them; or of the Rights and Privileges of Churches established by them; for while any footsteps of ancient liberty, simplicity and integrity did remain, a claim of paramount or lawless Authority would have been very ridiculous and very odious. Pope Zosimus I. denieth that he could alter the Privileges of Churches.

P. Hil. Ep. 2. N. 8.  
P. Innoc. I. Ep. 2. 12.  
P. Hil. Ep. 4.  
P. Gelaf. I. Ep. 9. p. 634.  
Ep. 13. p. 639.  
De Anathem. p. 645.

P. Zos. I. Ep. 7. (ad Episc. Vienn. & Narb.)  
Caus. 25. Qu. 1. cap. 7.

10. If they did talk more highly, requiring observance to their Constitutions, it was either in their own precinct, or in the Provinces where they had a more immediate jurisdiction, or in some corners of the *West*, where they had obtained more sway; and in some cases; wherein their words were backed with other inducements to obedience; for the Popes were commonly *wise in their generations*, accommodating their discourse to the state of times and places.

P. Siric. Ep. 1.  
Leo M. Ep. 1. cap. 5. P. Gelaf. Ep. 9.

11. It is also to be observed, that often the Popes are supposed to speak and constitute things by their own authority, which indeed were done by Synods, consisting of *Western Bishops* more closely adhering to that *See*, in regard to those Regions; the Decrees of which Synods were binding in those places, not so much by virtue of *Papal* authority, as proceeding from the consent of their own *Bishops*: how ready soever he were to assume all to himself, pretending those Decrees as precepts of the *Apostolical See*.

P. Siric. Ep. 4.  
"Αποστολὴ καὶ συνέσιον ἐκ τῶν Conc. Eph. p. 332.  
Συνεδριὸν ἀνέκυρσε τῇ αὐτίδῃ Ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Syn. Pl. Act. 4. p. 60.  
N. The Pope did in those Councils ask the *Placets*. P. Hil. in Conc. R. (p. 578.)

Whence all the Acts of modern Popes are invalid, and do not oblige, seeing they do not act in Synod; but onely of their own Head, or with the advice of a few Partizans about them, men linked in common interest with them to domineer over the Church.

12. Yet even in the *Western Countries*, in later aimes, their Decrees have been contested, when they did seem plainly to clash with the old *Canons*, or much to derogate from the Liberties of Churches; nor have there wanted learned Persons in most times, who so far as they durst, have expressed their dislike of this Usurpation.

For



*Licet namque Pontifex Romana Ecclesia ob dignitatem Apostolica Sedis ceteris in orbe constitutis reverentior habeatur, non tamen ei licet transgredi in aliquo Canonici moderaminis tenorem, sicut cum unusquisque Orthodoxa Ecclesia Pontifex ac Sponsus propriae Sedis uniformiter speciem gerit Salvatoris, ita generaliter nulli convenit quippiam in aliterius precatiter patrare Episcopi Diocesi. Glab. Rod. 2. 4. Vid. Baron. Ann. 996. scilicet. 22. 23.*

*Circa Ann. 860.*

*Noli quia Decreta ipsorum non susceperis amplius asserere, cum ipsi nihil nisi quod Naturalis, quod Moisaica, necnon & Gratiae Lex jussit, instituant. P. Nic. I. Ep. 11. (ad Phot.)*

*Decretalia autem, qua à Sanctis Pontificibus Primae Sedis Romana Ecclesiae sunt instituta, — cur vos non habere vel observare dicitis? Id Ep. 6. (ad Phot.)*

*Vid. Hinom.*

*Quaquam quidam vestrum scripserint haud illa decretalia praeceptorum Pontificum in toto codicis Canonum corpore contineri descripta, &c. P. Nic. I. Ep. 42.*

*(ad Galliae Episc.)*

15. The power of enacting and dispensing with Ecclesiastical Laws touching exterior Discipline did of old belong to the Emperour. And it was reasonable that it should; because old Laws might not conveniently suite with the present state of things and the publick welfare; because new Laws might conduce to the good of Church and State, the care of which is incumbent on him; because the Prince is bound to use his power and authority to promote God's Service, the best way of doing which may be by framing Orders conducive thereto.

Accordingly the Emperours did enact divers Laws concerning Ecclesiastical matters, which we see extant in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian.

*Hac — Domino Imperatori praesentanda decrevimus, poscentes ejus clementiam ut siquid hic minus est, ejus prudentia suppleatur, si quid secus quam se ratio habet, ejus judicio emendetur; si quid rationaliter taxatum est, ejus adjutorio divina opitulante clementia perficiatur. Conc. Arel. 4. c. 26. Ann. 813. (sub Carolo M.)*

*P. Greg. I. Ep. 11. 56.*

We may observe that Popes did allow the validity of Imperial Laws. Pope Gregory I. doth alledge divers Laws of divers Emperours concerning Ecclesiastical affairs as authentick and obligatory Rules of practice.

16. Divers Churches had particular rights of independency upon all power without themselves.

Such as the Church of Cyprus in the Ephesine Synod did claim and obtain the confirmation of.

For although the Bishop of Rome be more venerable than the rest that are in the world, upon account of the dignity of the Apostolical See, yet it is not lawful for him in any case to transgress the order of Canonical governance; for as every Bishop who is of the Orthodox Church, and the Spouse of his own See, doth intirely represent the Person of our Saviour; so generally or Bishop ought pragmatically to act any thing in anothers Diocese.

13. In the times of Pope Nicolas I. the Greeks did not admit the Roman Decrees; so that Pope in an Epistle to Photius complains that he did not receive the Decrees of the Popes whenas yet they ordained nothing but what the natural, what the Moisaical, and what the Law of Grace required. And in another Epistle he expostulates with him for saying that they neither had nor did observe the Decrees made by the Holy Popes of the Prime See of the Roman Church.

14. That which greatly did advance the Papal Jurisdiction, and introduced his Usurpation of obtruding new Decrees on the Church, was the venting of the forged Decretal Epistles under the name of Old Popes; which when the Pope did alledge for authorizing his practices, the French Bishops, endeavouring to assert their Privilege, did alledge that they were not contained in the whole body of their Canons.

*These things (saith the Council of Arles) we have decreed to be presented to our Lord the Emperour, desiring his clemency that if any thing be defective it may be supplied by his prudence, if any thing be unreasonable it may be corrected by his judgment, if any thing be reasonably ordered it may by his help, the Divine Grace assisting, be perfected.*

Such

Such was the ancient Church of Britain, before *Austin* came into England.

*The Welsh Bishops are consecrated by the Bishop of St. Davids, and he himself in like manner is ordained by others who are as it were his Suffragans, professing no manner of subjection to any other Church.*

*Episcopi Wallia à Menevensi Antistite sunt consecrati, & ipse similiter ab aliis tanquam suffraganeis est constitutus, nulla penitus alii Ecclesie facta professione vel subiectione. Girald. Cambr. Itin. 2. 1.*

V. Sovereign power, immediately by it self when it pleaseth, doth exercise all parts of Jurisdiction, setting it self in the Tribunal; or mediately doth execute it by others, as its Officers or Commissioners.

Wherefore now the Pope doth claim and exercise Universal Jurisdiction over all the Clergy; requiring of them engagements of strict submission and obedience to him; demanding that all causes of weight be referred to him; citing them to his bar, examining and deciding their causes; condemning, suspending, deposing, censuring them, or acquitting, absolving, restoring them, as he seeth cause, or findeth in his heart; He doth encourage people to accuse their pastours to him, in case any doth infringe his Laws and Orders.

But (in general) that originally or anciently the Pope had no such right appropriate to him may appear by arguments, by cross instances, by the insufficiency of all pleas, and examples alledged in favour of this claim. For,

1. Originally there was not at all among Christians any jurisdiction like to that which is exercised in Civil Governments, and which now the papal Court doth execute. For this our Saviour did prohibit, and Saint Peter forbade the Presbyters *κατακλιθεὶς ἐπὶ κλῆρον*. And 1. Pet. 5. St. Chrysostome affirmeth the Episcopal power not to be *ἀνδρική*, or *ἀρχή*. And Ecclesiastical History doth inform us, that such a Jurisdiction was lately introduced in the Church, as by other great Bishops, so especially by the Bishop of Rome: For (saith Socrates) from that time the Episcopacy of Alexandria, beyond the Sacerdotal Order did assume a domineering power in affairs.

The which kind of power the Roman Bishops had long before assumed; for, (saith he) the Episcopacy of Rome, in like manner as that of Alexandria, had already a great while agoe gone before in a domineering power beyond that of the Priesthood.

At first the Episcopal power did onely consist in Paternal admonition, and correction of offenders, exhorting and persuading them to amendment; and in case they contumaciously did persist in disorderly behaviour, bringing them before the Congregation, and the cause being there heard and proved, with its consent imposing such penance or correction on them as seemed needful for the publick good, or their particular benefit; *All things* (saith St. Cyprian) *shall be examined you being present and judging*. And (elsewhere) *according to your divine suffrages; according to your pleasure*.

2. Originally no one Bishop had any Jurisdiction over another, or authority to judge his actions; as St. Cyprian (who well knew the current

*Per hoc illam de tota Ecclesia judicare. P. Gelaf. 1. Ep. 4. Cunctos ipse judicaturus à nemine est judicandus. Dist. 40. cap. 6. Caus. 2. qu. 7. cap. 45. &c. Sacra statuta & veneranda decreta Episcoporum causas, utpote majora negotia nostra definendas censura mandaverunt. P. Nic. 1. Ep. 38.*

*Chryf. in 1 Tim. 3. 1. in Eph. Orat. 11 Hier. Ep. 3 & Ep. 62. Iud. Pelus. Ep. 20. 125. 4. 219.*

*Καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνῃ ἡ Ἐπισκοπὴ Ἀλεξανδρίας πρὶν τὴν ἐξαρχίαν τὰς ἐκείνης καὶ διοικεῖν ἐπὶ πρεσβυτέρων ὡς αὐτὸς τὸ ἀρχαῖον. Socr. 7. 7.*

*— τὸ Ῥωμαίων Ἐπισκοπὴς ὁμοίως τῷ Ἀλεξανδρίῳ πρὶν τὴν ἐξαρχίαν καὶ διοικεῖν ὡς αὐτὸς τὸ ἀρχαῖον. Socr. 7. 11.*

*1 Cor. 5. 4. 12. — 2 Cor. 2. 6. — Examinabuntur singule presentibus, & judicantibus vobis. Cypr. Ep. 12. (fratribus in plebe.)*

*Secundum vestra divina suffragia. Cypr. Ep. 40.*

*Secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum. Ibid. (Ep. 46.)*

*Tertul. Apol. 39. ibidem. —*

rent judgment and practice of his age) in many places doth affirm:

*Expectemus univ[er]si judicium Domini  
nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus ha-  
bet potestatem & praeponendi nos in Ec-  
clesiam suam gubernatione & de actu no-  
stro judicandi. Cypr. in Conc. Carth.*

who particularly doth reflect on the Roman Bishop, for presuming to censure his brethren, who dissented from him: *Let us all (saith he) expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only hath power to prefer us to the government of his Church and to judge of what we doe.*

3. Even the community of Bishops did not otherwise take notice of, or intermeddle with the proceedings of any Bishop in his precinct and charge; except when his demeanour did concern the general state of the Church, intrenching upon the common faith, or publick order and peace.

In other cafes for one or more Bifhops to meddle with the proceedings of their brother, was taken for an ἀλλοτρίως ποσυχία, a pragmatifal intrufion upon anothers bufinefs; and an invafion of that Liberty which did belong to each Bifhop, by the grant of our Lord, and the nature of his Office.

As by those passages of St *Cyprian*, and the declaration of the *Synod* with him doth appear.

**CAN. 5.**

*In venerabilis  
Concilii Nice-  
ni contumelia  
sepe versatus,  
alienarum tibi*

4. In cases needing decision for the publick good of the Church, the Law and Custom of the Church, confirmed by the *Nicene* Synod, did order, that jurisdiction should be exercised, and all causes finally determined in each *Province*; so that no regard is had to the Pope, no exception in favour of him being expressed or implied.

The which Constitution, if we believe Pope *Leo* himself, cannot in any case by any power be revoked or infringed.

That is most expressly confirmed by the Synod of *Antioch*, in the Code

[illegible]

of the Univerſal Church, If any Biſhop accuſed of certain crimes ſhall be condemned by all the Biſhops in the province, and all ſhall unanimouſly vote againſt him, he ſhall not be judged again by others; but the unanimous ſentence of the Biſhops of the Province ſhall remain valid.

**Here is no consideration or exception from the Pope.**

5. Accordingly in practice, Synods without regard or recourse to the Pope, did judge Bishops upon offences charged against them.

6. The execution of those judgments was entrusted to *Metropolitan* Bishops; or had effect by the peoples consent; for it being declared that any Bishop had incurred condemnation, the people did presently desert him.

*Quod non so-  
lùm præsuli  
Apostolico fa-  
cere licet, sed  
Catholica con-*

Every Bishop was obliged to confer his part to the execution; as Pope *Gelasius* affirmeth.

7. If the Pope had such judicial power, seeing there were from the beginning so many occasions of exercising it, there would have been extant in History many clear instances of it, but few can be alledged; and those (as we shall see) impertinent, or insufficient.

8. Divers Synods (great and smaller) did make Sanctions contrary to this pretence of the Pope; appointing the decision of Causes to be terminated in each *Diocese*; and prohibiting appeals to him; which





Upon a Sovereign all Inferiour Magistrates depend.

VI. To the Sovereign of any State belongeth the Choice, Constitution, Confirmation, Commissioning of all inferiour Magistrates; that none uncapable, unworthy, or unfit for Offices, or disaffected to the State, be entrusted with the management of affairs.

Wherefore the Pope doth claim and exercise these Prerogatives so far as he can; pretending at least that no Bishop can be constituted without his designation, or his licence, and his confirmation of the nomination, collation or election.

Bell. 4. 24.

And these privileges by the great Advocates are upon highest terms asserted to him.

In this matter may be distinguished,

1. The Designation of the Person by Election or otherwise.
2. The Confirmation of that.
3. The Ordination or Consecration of him to his Office; the which conferreth on him his Character and authority.
4. The Authority by which he acteth.

Into all these the Pope hath intruded himself, and he will have a finger in them.

1. He gladly would have drawn to himself the collation and disposal of all Benefices, challenging a general right to dispose of all at his pleasure; but not having been able wholly to deprive Princes and Patrons of their Nominations, and Corporations of their Election; yet he hath by Reservations, Provisions, Collations of Vacancies *apud Sedem*, \* Resignations, Devolutions, and other such tricks, extremely encroached on the rights of all, to the infinite vexation, damage and mischief of Christendom.

*Licet Ecclesiarum, Personatum, Dignitatum, aliorumque Beneficiorum Ecclesiasticorum plenaria dispositio ad Romanum noscatur Pontificem pertinere, &c. Clem. IV. in Sexto lib. 3. tit. 4. cap. 2. Vid. ib. c. 4. 10. 12. 20. \* Ib. c. 14. &c.*

Although the plenary disposal of all Churches, Parsonages, Dignities and other Ecclesiastical Benefices be known to belong to the Pope of Rome, &c.

2. He pretendeth that no Bishop shall be ordained without his Licence.

3. He obligeth the Person Ordained to swear obedience to him.

4. He pretendeth that all Bishops are his Ministers and Deputies.

But no such Privileges have any foundation or warrant in Holy Scripture, in Ancient Doctrine, or in Primitive Usage: they are all Encroachments upon the original Rights and Liberties of the Church derived from Ambition and Avarice; subsisting upon Usurpation, upheld by Violence.

This will appear from a Survey of Ancient Rules and Practices concerning this matter.

The first constitution after our Lord's decease of an Ecclesiastical person was that of *Matthias* into the vacant Apostolate, or *Bishoprick* of *Judas*; wherein (upon Saint *Peter's* motion) all the disciples present did by consent present two; out of whom God himself did elect one, by determining the lot to fall upon *Matthias*; so that this designation being partly humane, partly divine; so faras it was humane, it went by free election of the whole fraternity; and Saint *Peter*, beside generally suggesting the matter to be done, did assume nothing peculiar to himself.

The next constitution we meet with is that of *Deacons* to assist the Apostles and Elders in discharge of inferiour Offices; wherein the

Apo-

Act. 1.

\* Ερωτασεν τὸν κύριον καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι. V. 20.

Verf. 15.

Καὶ ἐκείνους δύο. Verf. 23.

\* Ἀνέστησαν οὖν τέτταρες ἄνθρωποι σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ. Verf. 5.

Apostles did commit the designation of the persons to the *multitude of the disciples*, who *elect* them; and *presented* them to the Apostles, who by *prayer and laying on of hands* did *ordain* them. Nor had Saint Peter in this action any particular stroke.

As to the Constitution of Bishops, in the first Apostolical times the course was this; The Apostles, and Apostolical persons (who were authorized by the Apostles to act with their power, and in their stead) did in Churches founded by them constitute Bishops, such as divine inspiration, or their grace of discretion did guide them to; So did Saint John in Asia, *setting those apart for the Clergy whom the Spirit had markt out*.

This was not done without the consent of the Christian people, as *Clemens Romanus* telleth us in his excellent *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*: But he doth not acquaint us (although he were himself Bishop of Rome) that the Pope had any thing to doe in such Constitutions, or in Confirmations of them; *the whole Church* (saith he) *consenting*; why doth he not add, for his own sake, *and the Pope confirming*?

In the next times, when those extraordinary persons and faculties had expired, when usually the Churches planted were in situation somewhat incoherent and remote from each other, upon a vacancy the Clergy and people of each Church did elect its Bishop; in which action commonly the Clergy did propound and recommend a person, or persons, and the people by their consent approve, or by their suffrages elect one; a strict examination of his Life and Doctrine intervening: the which Order *Tertullian* briefly doth intimate in those words, *The Presidents of the Church are certain Elders well approved, who have obtained that honour not by price, but by proof*.

It may be enquired, how a Bishop then was Ordained, in case his City was very remote from any other Churches?

Did they send for Bishops from distant places to Ordain him; Or did the Presbyters of the place lay their hands on him? Or did he receive no other Ordination than that he had before of Presbyter? Or did he abide no Bishop till opportunity did yield Bishops to Ordain him? Or did providence order, that there should be no such solitary Churches? The ancient *Commentatour*, contemporary to St. *Ambrose*, and bearing his name, did conceive, that upon decease of a Bishop the elder of the Presbyters did succeed into his place. \* Whence had he this, out of his invention and conjecture, or from some Tradition and History?

Afterward, when the Faith was diffused through many Provinces, that Churches grew thick and close, the general practice was this: The neighbour Bishops (being advertised of a vacancy or want of a Bishop) did convene at the place; then in the Congregation the Clergy of the place did propound a person, yielding their attestation to his fitness for the charge; which the people hearing did give their suffrages, accepting him, if no weighty cause was objected

Act. 6. 2. τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν ἤ ἐξέλεξαν. Verſ. 5.

Nor had Saint Pe-

καὶ ἐξ' αὐτοῦ καὶ πάλιν προσβύτην, ὡς ἐστὶν σοὶ δὲ ἀξίωμα. Tit. 2. 5.

Διὰ κείνους πόδια. 1. Cor. 12. 10. Καὶ ἔγωγε ἵνα γὰρ κληρωθῶν τῷ ὑπὸ τῷ πόδι σιωπῶν. Euf. 3. 23.

Τὸ ἐν καταστάσει ὑπὸ ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐκλογίμων ἀποδιδόντες. Clem. Epist. p. 57.

καὶ ὅτοι δοκιμαζέσθων προὔποντες, εἴ τι διακρίνωσιν, ἀνὴρ καλὸς ὄντως. 1 Tim. 3. 10.

Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti. Tertul. Apol. 39.

Plena diligentia, exploratione sincera. Cyr. Ep. 68.

Primum Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur ut recedente uno sequens ei succederet, &c. Vid. Diss. 66. cap. 2.

At first Presbyters were called Bishops that one departing the next might succeed him.

\* In Eph. 4. 11.



against him; or refusing him, if such cause did appear: Then upon such recommendation and acceptance; the Bishops present did adjoin their approbation and consent; then by their devotions, and solemn laying on of their hands, they did Ordain or Consecrate him to the Function.

Of this course most commonly practiced in his time we have divers plain Testimonies in St. Cyprian, the best Author extant concerning these matters of ancient Discipline:

*Propter quod diligenter de traditione divina & Apostolica observatione observandum est & tenendum, quod apud nos quoque & fere per Provincias universas tenetur; ut ad ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur plebe præsentè, quæ singulorum vitam plenissimè novit, & uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit; quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sabini Collegæ nostri ordinatione, ut de universa fraternitatis suffragio, & de Episcoporum, qui in præsentia convenerant, quique de eo ad vos literas fecerant, judicio Episcopatus ei deferretur. Cypr. Ep. 68.*

which had assembled in the presence, and had sent letters to you about him, the Bishoprick should be deferr'd to him.

Again, A people obedient to the Lord's commands, and fearing God, ought to separate it self from a wicked Bishop (such a notoriously wicked Bishop as those were of whom he treateth, who had renounced the Faith) and not to mingle it self with the sacrifices of a sacrilegious Priest; seeing especially that it hath a power either to chuse worthy Priests, or to refuse those who are unworthy; the which also we see to descend from divine authority that a Bishop should be chosen the people being present, before the eyes of all; and that he who is worthy and fit should be approved by publick judgment and testimony.

*Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis & Deum metuens à peccatore præposito separare se debet, nec se ad sacrilegi Sacerdotis sacrificia miscere; quando ipsi maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi; quod & ipsum videmus de divina auctoritate descendere; ut Sacerdos plebe præsentè sub omnium oculis deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur—Cypr. Ep.*

*Suffragio totius populi Cyprianus eligi. Optat. 1.*

*Ceterum quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando populi universi suffragio in pace deligitur—Cui si secundum magisteria divina obtemperaret fraternitas universa, nemo adversum Sacerdotum Collegium quidquam moveret; nemo post divinum judicium, post populi suffragium, post coepiscoporum consensum, judicem se jam non Episcopi sed Dei faceret—Cypr. Ep. 55.*

*Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei, & Christi ejus judicio, de Clericorum penè omnium testimonio, de plebis, quæ tunc assuit, suffragio, & de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum Collegio—Cypr. Ep. 52.*

*Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia de Dei judicio, & Cleri ac plebis suffragio orationato—Cypr. Ep. 67.*

*Episcopo semel facto, & Collegorum ac plebis testimonio & judicio comprobato—Ep. 41. (ad Cornel.)*

Again, when (saith he concerning himself) a Bishop is substituted in the place of one deceased, when he is peaceably chosen by the suffrage of all the people—and whom if according to the divine instructions the whole fraternity would obey, no man would move any thing against the College of Priests; none after the divine judgment; after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the fellow-Bishop, would make himself judge not indeed of the Bishop, but of God.

Again, Cornelius was made Bishop by the judgment of God and his Christ, by the testimony of almost all the Clergy, by the suffrage of the people being then present, and by the College of Priests, ancient and good men—and Cornelius being in the Catholick Church ordained by the judgment of God, and by the suffrage of the Clergy and people.

Again, When a Bishop is once made, and is approved by the testimony and the judgment of his Collegues, and of the people—

The

The Author of the Apostolical Constitutions thus in the person of Saint Peter very fully and clearly describeth the manner of Ordination of Bishops in his times: *After one of the chief Bishops present has thus prayed, the rest of the Priests with all the people shall say, Amen; and after the prayer, one of the Bishops shall deliver the Eucharist into the hands of the person ordained, and that morning he shall be placed by the rest of the Bishops in his Throne, all of them saluting him with a kiss in the Lord. After the reading of the Law and Prophets, of our Epistles, the Acts and Gospel, he who is ordained shall salute the Church with these words, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God the Father, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all, Amen. And let all answer, And with thy spirit. After which words let him exhort the people.*

*Const. Apost. 8 4. Postquam hæc erit precatus, &c.*

Thus it was then, in a practice so obvious and observable, that a Pagan Emperour took good notice of it, and chose to imitate it in constituting the Governours of Provinces, and other Officers; When (saith Lampridius of Alexander Severus) he would either give rulers to Provinces or make presidents, or ordain procuratours, he set up their names, exhorting the people if they had any thing against them, to prove it by manifest evidence, if they could not make their accusation good they were to die for it, and he said 'twould be hard not to doe that in the choice of Governours of Provinces, to whom the lives and fortunes of men were entrusted, which the Christians and Jews did in setting up those who were to be ordained Priests.

*Ubi aliquos voluisset vel rectores Provinciarum dare, vel prepositos facere, vel procuratores id est rationales ordinare, nomina eorum proponebat, hortans, populum, ut si quid haberet criminis, probaret manifestis rebus; si non probasset, subiret penam capitis; dicebatque grave esse, quum id Christiani & Judei facerent in predicandis Sacerdotibus qui ordinandi sunt, non fieri in Provinciarum Relectoribus, quibus & fortune hominum committerentur & capita. Lamprid. in Alex. Sev. cap. 45.*

Afterward in process of time, when (the gaps of distance being filled up, and Christendom becoming one continued Body) Ecclesiastical Discipline was improved into a more complete shape, for Constitution of a Bishop, all the Bishops of a Province did convene, (or such as could with convenience, the others signifying their mind by writing) and having approved him who was recommended by the Clergy, and allowed by the people, they did ordain him; the Metropolitan of the Province ratifying what was done.

*Παλαιὰ Σύνοδος. Syn. Constantinop. Theod. 5. 9.*

So the Nicene Synod, regarding the practice which had commonly obtained, did appoint with a qualification to be generally observed: *It is most fit (say they) that a Bishop be constituted by all Bishops in the Province; but if this be hard, either because of urgent necessity, or for the length of the way, then three of the body being gathered together (those also who are absent conspiring in opinion, and yielding their consent in writing) let the Ordination be performed, but let the ratification of what is done be assigned to the Metropolitane in each Province.*

*Ἐπίσκοπον οὐδέποτε Μόλις μὴν ἑκὼν πάντων ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι — τὸ δὲ καὶ ἡ συνουσία ἀποκρίσας τῶν ἐκείνων ἐπαρχίαν τῇ μητροπολίτι — Conc. Nic. Can. 4.*

*Vid. Can. Apost. 1. Conc. Antioch. Can. 19. Conc. Laod. Can. 12. Conc. Afr. Can. 13.*

In this Canon (the which is followed by divers Canons of other Synods) there is no express mention concerning the interest of the Clergy and people in election of the Bishops; but these things are onely passed over, as precedaneous to the Constitution or Ordination, about which onely the Fathers did intend to prescribe; supposing the election to proceed according to former usual practice.

That we ought thus to interpret the Canon, so that the Fathers did not intend to exclude the people from their choice, doth appear from their Synodical Epistle; wherein they decree concerning

Bishops

Εἰ δὲ πᾶς συμβαίνει ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ  
ἐν τῇ ἑκκαυστίᾳ, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀπορροαθεὶς  
καὶ εἰς τὴν πῦρ καὶ τὴν ἀλμυρὰ καὶ τοῦ  
ἀέρος συσπληθεῖται, μόνον ἡ ἕξις ἐπι-  
νοεῖται, καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις. οὕτως οὖν ἐπι-  
νοεῖται καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις, καὶ ἡ ἐκκαυστίς  
αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁποῦν ἐκκαυστίς αὐτῶν  
ἐκκαυστίς. Ἐκκαυστίς. Socr. i. 9. The-  
od. i. 9.

sufficient evidence do interpret the Canon not to concern the Election, but the Ordination of Bishops.

Theod. 5. 9. Thus the *Fathers* of the *second General Synod* plainly did interpret this Canon by their proceeding; for they in their *Synodical Epistle* to Pope *Damasus* and the *Western Bishops*, did assure him, that they

Παλαῖς τε δεσμὸς καὶ πόλις, καὶ τὸ  
ἀγίον ἐν Νικαίᾳ Πατέρων ὁρθό —  
Οἷς ἀκολούθως —

—αὐ καὶ τῶν ὑμνοῦντων, καὶ ὁψεν καὶ  
 θεωροῦντες βασιλείαν Θεοδοσιῶν, παντός  
 τε τῶ καὶ ἔργου, καὶ πάσης ὑποψήφισις ἀμφότες τῶ  
 πύλων.

— Ἐπίσκοπον Θλαβιανόν οἱ τε ὁ  
ἐπαρχίας, καὶ ὁ Ἀναπληκτὴς διοικήσας  
συνέβρομάν τις χειρὶν καὶ χερσὶν ἵσταται,  
πάντες συμφέροντες ἡ Ἐκκλησίας ὡς αὐτὸς διὰ  
μας θεῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος πνεύματος.

Ath. Apol. 2.  
p. 7:6.

Indeed the practice generally doth confirm this, the People every where continuing to elect their Bishop: So did the People of *Alexandria* demand *Athanasius* for their Bishop. So Pope *Julius*

Μὴ ἀνδρίᾳ τῆς Πρεσβυτέρους, μὴ  
περ' Ἐποκόπων, μὴ λαῶν. Ath.  
ibid. p. 749.  
Orat. 19. p. 310.  
Epist. 21.

Scio post obitus Episcoporum per ambi-  
tiosos aut contentiosos solere Ecclesias per-  
turbari — Aug. Ep. 110.

Euseb. de Vit. Const. 3. 59, 60.  
Socr. 1. 24.  
Μεταδ' ὅ τ' ἰσχυρὰ —  
Sozom. 6. 23. Marcell. lib. 27.  
Δι' ἡμ' ἡμετέρας τὸ πᾶν —  
Socr. 1. 24. Soz. 3. 4. Theod. 4. 6.

Ἐμὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν Ἐπισκοποι τῆ Ἀσίας  
 Ἰερῶν καὶ τῶν λαμβανουσῶν, καὶ τῶν λογιστῶν,  
 καὶ τῶν οὐλαβεσθῆναι πάντες κλητῶν, καὶ τῶν λοι-  
 πῶν πάντων τῶν πόλεως πύσης ἐχουσέθον-  
 σιν. *Comc. Chalc. Act. 11. p. 404.*

Ἐπεὶ ὃ μὲν πολλῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ βίας ἐνθροονίζουσιν εἰς πῶς αὐτῶν πόλιν ἔφεσαν ὁ λαὸς, καὶ ὁ κληθεὶς, καὶ εἰ Ἐπίσκοπος.  
*Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> Ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅτι ἡ πόλις ἦλθε πρὸς ἐμὲ οἷς  
<sup>2</sup> Ἀγνώσαν καὶ ἐκέλευσαι τὰ ψαλίσματα. Syn.  
 Chalc. *AF.* 16. p. 462.

Bishops constituted by Meletius, who returning to communion with the Church did live in any City, that, *If any Catholick Bishop should happen to die, then should those who were already received ascend into the honour of him deceased; in case they should appear worthy, and the people should chuse, the Bishop of Alexandria withall adding his suffrage to him, and his confirmation; the which words with*

of the *second General Synod* plainly did interpret  
ir proceeding; for they in their *Synodical Epistle*  
nd the *Western Bishops*, did assure him, that they  
in the Constitution of Bishops for the principal  
*Eastern Sees*, had followed this Order of the  
Synod of Nice, together with the *ancient law of the*  
*Church*; in agreement whereto they had ordained  
*Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople*; with common  
consent, under the eyes of the most religious Empe-  
rour *Theodosius*, and of all the Clergy, the whole  
City adjoining also its suffrage; and that for *Antioch*,  
the Bishops of the Province, and of the *Eastern*  
*Diocese* concurring had canonically ordained  
*Flavianus* Bishop, the whole Church consenting as  
with one voice to honour the person.

tice generally doth confirm this, the People  
 nuing to elect their Bishop: So did the People  
 and *Athanasius* for their Bishop. So Pope *Julius*  
 did complain that *Gregory* was intruded into  
 the place of *Athanasius*; *not being required by*  
*the Presbyters, not by the Bishops, not by the Peo-*  
*ple.* So *Gregory Nazianzene* describeth the Elec-  
 tions of Bishops in his times to be carried by  
 the power of wealthy men, and impetuousness  
 of the people. So *Austin* intimateth the same  
 in his Speech about designation of a Succes-  
 sor to himself, *I know,* says he, *that after the*  
*decease of Bishops the Churches are wont to be dis-*  
*turbed by ambitious and contentious men.* So the  
 tumults at *Antioch*, in chusing a Bishop after  
*Eustathius*; at *Rome* after *Liberius*; at *Constanti-*  
*nople* after *Alexander*; at *Milain* when *St. Am-*  
*brose* was chosen.

So *Stephanus* Bishop of *Ephesus* in justification of himself faith, Me forty Bishops of *Asia* by the suffrage of the most noble and of the substantial Citizens, and of all the most reverend Clergy, and of all the rest of the whole City, did Ordain; and his Competitour *Bassianus*, Me, with great constraint and violence, the people and the Clergy, and the Bishops did install.

In the Synod of Chalcedon, Eusebius Bishop of Ancyra, saith, that the whole City of Gangra did come to him bringing their suffrages, Possidius tel-



leth us of St. *Austin*, that in ordaining Priests and Clergymen he deemed the greater consent of Christians, and the custom of the Church was to be followed.

So *Celestine the First*: Let no Bishop be given them against their wills; let the consent and request of the Clergy, the people and the order be expected; and Pope *Leo the First*, When there shall be an election of a Bishop, let him be prefer'd who has the unanimous consent of the Clergy and people; so that if the votes be divided and part for another person, let him, by the judgment of the Metropolitan, be prefer'd whose merits and interest are greatest, onely that none may be ordained against their wills or without their desire, lest the unwilling people contemn or hate a Bishop whom they never desired, and become less religious than they ought, because they could not have such a Bishop as they would. And in other of his Epistles, There is no reason that they should be accounted Bishops, who were neither chosen by the Clergy, nor desired by the people, nor with the Metropolitan's order consecrated by the Provincial Bishops.---

Certainly the desires of the Citizens, and the testimonies of the people should have been expected, with the judgment of the honourable and the choice of the Clergy, which in the Ordinations of Priests use to be observ'd by those who knew the rules of the Fathers-- When peaceably and with such concord as God loves, he who is to be a teacher of peace is ordained by the agreement of all--- Let Priests who are to be ordained be required peaceably and quietly: let the subscription of the Clergy, the testimony of the honourable, the consent of the order and people be observed; let him who is to preside over all be chosen by all. And Pope *Nicholas I.* Because we know the custom of your Royal City, that none can arrive at the top of the highest Priestly power without the assent of the Ecclesiastical people and the Emperor's suffrage.

Now in all these proceedings it is most apparent that there was no regard had to the Pope, or any thought of him, out of his particular Territory; which he had as Metropolitan, (or afterwards as Primate in some parts of the West.) No where else had he the least finger in the Constitution of a Bishop any where through the whole Church; no not of the least Clergy-man.

When by Saint *Cyprian* so largely and punctually the manner of Constituting Bishops is declared; when the *Nicene* Canons and those of other Synods do so carefully prescribe about the Ordination of them; when so many reports concerning the Election of Bishops do occur in History, why is there not a tittle of mention concerning any special interest of the Roman Bishops about them?

So true is that of *Alb. Crantzins*: There was no need then of Apostolical confirmation, it was sufficient if the Election were approv'd by the Archbishop: now the Church of Rome has assum'd to her self the rights of all Churches.

In ordinandis vero Sacerdotibus & Clericis consensum majorem Christianorum, & consuetudinem Ecclesie sequendam esse arbitrabatur. *Posid. in Aug. Vit. cap. 20.*

Nullus inuitis detur Episcopus; Cleri; plebis, & ordinis consensum ac desiderium requiratur--- *Celest. I. Ep. 2.*

Cum ergo de summi Sacerdotis electione tractabitur, ille omnibus proponatur, quem Cleri plebisque consensu concorditer postularint; ita ut si in aliam forte personam partium se vota dividerint Metropolitanus judicio is alteri preferatur, qui majoribus & studiis juretur & meritis, tantum ut nullus inuitis, & non potentibus ordinetur; ne Civitas Episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit, & fiat minus religiosa quam convenit, cui non licuit habere quem voluit. *P. Leo. I. Ep. 84. ad Anastas.*

Nulla ratio fuit, ut inter Episcopos habeantur, qui nec a Clericis sunt electi, nec a plebibus expetiti, nec a Provincialibus Episcopis cum Metropolitanis judicio consecrati. *P. Leo. I. Ep. 92.*

Expectarentur certe vota Civium, testimonio populorum, quareretur honorarium arbitrium, electio Clericorum, que in Sacerdotum solent ordinationibus ab his qui norunt Patrum regulas custodiri. *P. Leo. Ep. 89. Dist. cap. 27.*

Quum per pacem, & Deo placitam concordiam consensu omnium studis qui doctor pacis futurus est ordinatur. *Ibid.*

Per pacem & quietem Sacerdotes qui prefuturi sunt postulentur; teneatur subscriptio Clericorum, honorarium testimonium, ordinis consensus & plebis; qui prefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur. *Ibid.*

*P. Nich. I. Ep. 5.* Quia consuetudinem vestram novimus in Regia Urbe, minus apicem Archiepiscopatus potestatis aliquem posse habere sine Ecclesiastica plebis assensu, atque Imperiali suffragio.---  
*P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 70. Dist. 62.*

Nihil tunc opus erat Apostolice confirmatione; satis erat electionem ab Archiepiscopo comprobari; nunc ad se emittunt Ecclesiarum jura traxit Romana Ecclesia. *Crantz. Metrop. 7. 45.*

We

We may by the way observe, that in the first times they had not so much as an absolute power of ordaining a *Presbyter* in the Church of his own City without leave of the Clergy and People; as may be inferred

Διακαλυφθεὶς καὶ μετὰ τῶν κληρῶν,  
ἀλλὰ καὶ λαῶν πολλῶν, ἔβρισεν συζη-  
γεῖν αὐτῷ τὰς αὐτῶν χρεῖστας.  
P. Cornel. apud Euf. 6. 43.

that so hardly could ordain one Priest in his own Church, what authority could he have to constitute Bishops in all other Churches?

Bell. 2. 18. 20.

Satis est quod vestrae pietatis auxilio, &  
mei favoris assensu Episcopatum tantæ  
Urbis obtinuit. P. Leo. Ep. 54.  
De Marc. 3. 14. scilicet. 1.

Ut ordinationem rite celebrandum tua  
quoque firmet auctoritas. P. Leo. Ep. 84.  
(ad Anastas.)

Donatum--- ita Dominico volumus gregi  
presidere, ut libellum fidei sue ad nos me-  
minere dirigendum --- P. Leo. Ep. 87.  
Salonica Civitatis Episcopus ne ac re-  
sponsali meo nesciente ordinatus est, &  
facta res est, quæ sub nullis anterioribus  
principibus evenit. Greg. Ep. 4. 34.

Ἀλεξανδρίης ἐπαρχίῃ τὴν Πέ-  
τρον ἀπὸ τῆς Ρώμης καὶ ῥαυμάτων  
δομῶν τῆς Νικαίας δεξαμένη καὶ  
ἐπὶ χρεῖστας κληρῶν, ἀπεδούρα  
τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Sozom. 6. 39.

Confirmation here signifie but approbation; for did he otherwise confirm the *Nicene* Decrees? did they need other Confirmation?

To the former Instances we answer, that being well considered they do much strengthen our Argument; in that they are so few, so late, so lame, so impertinent; for if the Pope had enjoyed a power of constituting Bishops, more instances of its exercise would have been producible; indeed it could not be but that History would have been full of them; the constitutions of Bishops being a matter of continual use, and very remarkable. At least they might have found one instance or other to alledge before the time of that busie Pope *Leo*; in whose time and by whose means Papal authority began to overflow its banks. And those which they produce do no-wise reach home to the point; *Anatolius* did obtain the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*

Ne enim vestra fidei & interventionis  
habentes intuitum, cum secundum sue con-  
secrat omis auctores ejus initia titubarent,  
benigniores erga ipsum quam justiores esse  
volumus--- P. Leo Ep. 55. (ad Martia-  
num.)

Dicebatur enim tuo B. memoria Flavi-  
ano propter defensionem Catholice verita-  
tis ejus, non immerito credebatur quod  
ordinatores sui contra Sanctorum Cano-  
num Constituta viderentur sui similem  
consecrasset. Post illa itaque ordinationis  
eius non inculpanda principia--- P. Leo Ep.  
55. ad Anatol.

Lib. cap. 12.

by the help of the Emperour, and by the assent of the Pope's favour: what then? *Anatolius* being put into that See in the room of *Flavianus*, by the influence of *Dioscorus* (whose Responfal he had been) and having favoured the *Eutychian* Faction, Pope *Leo* might thence have had a fair colour to disavow him as incapable of that Function and Dignity, he being so obnoxious; both having such a flaw in his Ordination, and having been guilty of great faults, adherence to the party of *Dioscorus*, and irregularly ordaining the Bishop of *Antioch*; but he out of regard to the Emperour's intervention did ac-

know-

knowledge *Anatolius* for Bishop; this was the favourable assent, with which he upbraideth *Anatolius*, having displeased him: and what doth this signifie?

Again Pope *Leo* did not reject *Maximus* Bishop of *Antioch* from communion, nor disclaimed his Ordination, although liable to exception: what then; is this a confirmation of him? No such matter; it was onely, which in such a vixonely Pope was a great favour, a forbearance to quarrel with him, as not duely ordained; which any other Bishop might have done. If a Pope had a flaw in his Ordination, another Bishop might refuse him.

Again Pope *Leo* did enjoin the Bishop of *Thessalonica* to confirm Ordinations: what is that to the purpose? It belonged to that Bishop, as a *Metropolitan*, by the Canons to confirm those in his *Province*, or as a *Primate*, to confirm those in his *Diocese*; It belonged to him as the Pope's Vicar in those Territories, to which the Pope had stretched his Jurisdiction, to execute the Pope's Orders; but what is this to Universal Authority? It is certain, that *Illyricum* was then in a more special manner subjected to the Pope's Jurisdiction, than any of the other *Eastern Churches*; what therefore he did there, cannot be drawn into consequence as to other places.

The same may be said in answer to the complaint of Pope *Gregory*, and to any the like Instances.

Moreover, surreptitious, presumptuous, pragmatistical intrusions, or usurpations of power do not suffice to found a right in this or any other case; to which purpose, and wholly to invalidate any such pleas, these Observations may be considered.

1. There do occur divers Instances of Bishops, who did meddle in Ordinations of other Bishops so as to bear great stroke in constituting them; who did not thereby pretend to Universal Jurisdiction; and it would be extremely ridiculous thence to infer they had any reasonable claim thereto.

Thus it was objected to *Athanasius*, that he presumed to ordain in Cities which did not belong to him. *Eusebius* of *Constantinople* did obtrude *Eusebius Emisenus* to be Bishop of *Alexandria*. *Eusebius* of *Antioch* did ordain *Evagrius* Bishop of *Constantinople*. *Enzoins* delivered unto *Lucius* the Bishoprick of *Alexandria*. *Lucifer*, a *Sardinian* Bishop, did ordain *Paulinus* Bishop of *Antioch*; they for a *Salvo* say, as the Pope's Legate, but upon what ground or testimony? why did not Historians tell us so much; the Pope had then been hissed at, if he had sent Legates about such errands; it was indeed out of presumption and pragmatistical zeal to serve a party, then ordinary in persons addicted to all parties, right and wrong; it not being then so expressly forbidden by the Canons as afterward.

*Theognis* and *Theodorus* did make *Macedonius* Bishop of *Constantinople*. *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* did ordain *St. Chrysostome*. The *Egyptian* Bishops surreptitiously did constitute *Maximus*, the *Cynick* Philosopher, Bishop of *Constantinople*. *Acacius*, (who had as little to do there as the Pope) did thrust *Endoxius* into the throne of *Con-*

Quod nos amore paranda fieri, & pacis studio retractare cessavimus. P. Leo Ep. 54. (ad Martian.) Conc. Chalc. Act. 10.

Αὐτὸν δὲ τὸτο ὕψωμα αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει, ὡς ἐν πόλει μὴδὲν αὐτῷ προσέκειτο, χρεῖσθαι ἐβόλωντο. Soz. 3. 21.

Ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, ὡς ἐπὶ Ἀἰδῶν, ὅπου καὶ Εὐσεβίου τὸ Κοινοῦ Πρωτεύοντος ἔπαινον. Soz. 2. 5.

Socr. 4. 14.

Ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει ὡς ἐπὶ Ἀντίοχ, τῷ Ἀρμένιῳ, τῷ ὄρει Ἐκκλησίας. Socr. 4. 21.

Ἐχρησάμενοι τῷ Παυλίῳ, Ἐπίσκοπον. Socr. 3. 6, Socr. 6. 2.

Soz. 2. 6.

Θεὸφιλος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ἐχρησάμενος. Socr.

6. 2.

Τότε καὶ πάντες τῷ Χρυσόστομῳ Ἐπισκοπῶν Κοινοῦ Πρωτεύοντος κατίστησαν, οἱ τὸτῳ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ συνεληλυθότες. Soz. 7. 9.

Τὸν δὲ Ἀκάκιον ὁ Θεὸφιλος τὸν αὐτῷ ἴσιν. Socr. 2. 13.



Ἡ δὲ ἐκείνη εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν διὰ  
τῆς Γερμανίας κατέστειτο ἀφικόμενος. Soz.  
7. 2. 3.

Ἀνακρίσας μὲν τὸν καὶ Πατριάρχην Μαξι-  
μου τὸν ἱεροσολύμων ἐξωδήσαντες καὶ ἄ-  
λλας ἀντιπαύσαντες. (Cav. Soz. 2. 238.)

Post consecrationem Antiocheni Episco-  
pi, quam sibi contra Canonicam re-  
gulam vindicasset—P. Leo. I. Epist. 53.  
(ad Anatol.)

Constantinople. Meletius of Antioch did constitute St. Gregory Nazianzene to the charge of Constantinople. Acacius and Patrophilus, extruding Maximus did in his room constitute Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem. Pope Leo doth complain of Anatolius, that against the Canonical rule he had assumed to himself the Ordination of the Bishop of Antioch.

2. To obviate these irregular and inconvenient proceedings, having crept in upon the dissensions in Faith and especially upon occasion of Gregory Nazianzene being constituted Bishop of Constantinople by Meletius, and Maximus being thrust into the same See by the Egyptians (whose Party for a time the Roman Church did countenance) the second General Synod did ordain that no Bishop should intermeddle about Ordinations without the bounds of his own Diocese.

3. In pursuance of this Law, or upon the ground of it, the Pope was sometimes checked, when he presumed to make a fally beyond his bounds in this or the like cases.

As when Pope Innocent I. did send some Bishops to Constantinople for procuring a Synod to examine the cause of St. Chrysostome; those

Τὸς μὲν ὑποστάντας ἀχλὺν ἐπαχλύνον-  
τες ἀπὸ μὲν ἐκπαρθεύσαντες παρὲν αὐτοῦ.  
Sozom. 8. 28.

of Constantinople—did cause them to be dismissed with disgrace as molesting a government beyond their bounds.

4. Even in the Western parts, after that the Pope had wrigled himself into most Countries there, so as to obtain sway in their transactions, yet he in divers places did not meddle in Ordinations;—we do not, says Pope Leo I. arrogate to our selves a power of ordaining in your Provinces.

Non enim nobis ordinationes vestrarum  
Provinciarum defendimus. P. Leo Ep. 89.

Even in some parts of Italy it self the Pope did not confirm Bishops till the times of Pope Nicholas I. as may be collected from the submission then of the Bishop of Ravenna to that condition, that he should have no power to consecrate Bishops canonically elected in the Regio Flaminia, unless it were granted him by letters from the Apostolical See.

— & ne ele-  
cti etiam Ca-  
nonici in Fla-  
minia Episco-  
pos consecrandi facultatem haberet, nisi si sibi à Sede Apostolica litteris concederetur. Plat. in P. Nichol. I.

And it was not without great opposition and struggling that he got that power other-where than in his original precincts, or where the juncture of things did afford him special advantage.

5. If Examples would avail to determine Right, there are more, and more clear Instances of Emperours interposing in the Constitution of Bishops, than of Popes. As they had ground in Reason, and authority in Holy Scripture. And Zadock the Priest did the King put in the

Euseb. de Vir. Const. 3. 59. 60.

Περὶ τῆς ἐκείνης τῆς βασιλείας τῶν ἱερῶν  
ἐγγράφων καὶ τῶν πᾶσι πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐκ-  
κλησίαις ἀποσταλῶν εἰς τὴν ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ  
ἐκείνους τῶν ἐκείνων τῶν ἐκείνων τῶν ἐκείνων  
καὶ Νεκταρίου ἀφικόμενος. Sozom. 7. 8.

\* Euseb. de Vir. Const. 3. 59. 60.

|| Ὅτι πρὶν αὐτὸν ἐπιτελεῖν, ἐχρη-  
σάμενος. Soz. 3. 6.

† Τὸς μὲν ἐξήλθον τῶν ἑλκυστῶν, ἐ-  
πίσης δ' ἀντὶ αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαις ἀποσταλῶν.  
Theodor. 2. 27.

room of Abiathar. Constantine did interpose at the designation of a Bishop at Antioch in the room of Euseb. Upon Gregory Nazianzene's recess from Constantinople, Theodosius (that excellent Emperour, who would not have infringed right) did command the Bishops present to write in paper the names of those whom each did approve worthy to be ordained, and reserved to himself the choice of one; and accordingly they obeying, he out of all that were nominated did elect Neftarius. \* Constantine did deliver the See of Constantinople to Eusebius Nicomediensis, || Constantine was angry with Macedonius because he was ordain'd without his licence. † He

re-

Pope Adrian with his whole Synod did deliver to Charles the Great the right and power of electing the Pope and ordaining the Apostolick See—He moreover defined that Archbishops and Bishops in every Province should receive investiture from him; and that if a Bishop were not commended and invested by the King, he should be consecrated by none; and whoever should act against this Decree, him he did noose in the band of anathema.

Hadrianus autem Papa eum universa  
Synodo tradiderunt iur & potestatem edi-  
cendi Pontificem, & ordinandi Apostoli-  
cam Sedem — Insuper Archiepiscopus &  
Episcopus per singulas Provincias ab omni-  
versis accipere definiuit; & nisi a  
Rege laudetur & investitur Episcopus,  
a nemine consecratur; & quicumque con-  
tra hoc decretum ageret, anathematiz-  
avimus eum innodavit. Distinct. 63. cap.  
22.

Largimur in perpetuum facultatem  
successorem, atque Summæ Sedis Apostoli-  
cæ Pontificem ordinandi, ac per hoc Ar-  
chiepiscopos seu Episcopos, &c. Distinc. 63.  
cap. 23.

Qui statim Romanorum inconstantia  
peritus auctoritatem omnem eligendi  
Pontificis à Clero populoque Romano ad  
Imperatorem transulit — Plat. in Leo  
VIII. p. 291.

The like privilege did Pope *Leo VIII.* attribute  
to the Emperour *Otho I.* We give him, says he,  
forever power to ordain a successor and Bishop of the  
chief Apostolick See, and change Archbishops, &c.  
And *Platina*, in his Life, says, That being weary of  
the inconstancy of the Romans, he transferr'd all au-  
thority to chuse a Pope from the Clergy and people of  
Rome to the Emperour.

Now I pray if this power of confirming Bishops do by Divine  
Institution belong to the Pope, how could he part with it, or trans-  
fer it on others; Is not this a plain renunciation in Popes of their  
Divine pretence?

Conc. Const. Sess. 40.

Conc. Bal. Sess. 37. (p. 98.)

Ἡμεῖς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ  
ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ — Theod. 5. 9.

6. General Synods by an authority paramount  
have assumed to themselves the constitution and  
confirmation of Bishops. So the Second General  
Synod did confirm the Ordination of *Nectarius*  
Bishop of *Constantinople*, and of *Flavianus* Bishop  
of *Antioch*, (this Ordination, say they, the Synod generally have admitted)  
although the *Roman Church* did not approve the Ordination of *Nectarius*,  
and for a long time after did oppose that of *Flavianus*. So the  
Fifth Synod it seemeth did confirm the Ordination of *Theophanius* Bi-  
shop of *Antioch*. So the Synod of *Pisa* did constitute Pope *Alexander V.*  
that of *Constance* Pope *Martin V.* that of *Basil* Pope *Felix V.*

7. All Catholick Bishops in old times might and commonly did  
confirm the Elections and Ordinations of Bishops, to the same ef-  
fect as Popes may be pretended to have done; that is by signifying  
their approbation, or satisfaction concerning the orthodoxy of their  
Faith, the attestation of their Manners, the legality of their Ordina-  
tion, no canonical Impediment; and consequently by admitting  
them to communion of peace and charity, and correspondence in  
all good Offices, which they express by returning κατενείκη ἐπιστολαὶ in  
answer to their Synodical—communicatory Letters.

Thus did *St. Cyprian* and all the Bishops of that Age confirm the Or-  
dination of Pope *Cornelius*, being contested by  
*Novatian*; as *St. Cyprian* in terms doth affirm,  
When the See of Saint Peter the Sacerdotal Chair was  
vacant, which by the will of God being occupied and  
by all our consents confirm'd, &c.— to confirm thy  
Ordination with a greater authority.

Cum locus Petri & gradus Cathedra  
Sacerdotalis vacaret, quo occupato de Dei  
voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consen-  
sione firmato. Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Anton.)  
Ad comprobendam ordinationem tuam  
falsam auctoritate majore — Ep. 45. ad  
Corn.

To which purpose, each Bishop did write Epistles to other Bi-  
shops (or at least to those of highest rank) acquainting them with  
his Ordination and enstallment, making a profession of his Faith,  
so as to satisfy them of his capacity of the Function.

8. But Bishops were complete Bishops before they did give such an

Ὅτι ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ μὴ μετὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν  
ἱεροκληρικῶς χειροτονήσαντες ἐκείνους  
ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν συνδικαίως ἐκείνους  
ἐκείνους ἐκείνους. Syn. VI. Act. 12. 198.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀκούοντες τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῆς  
ἐκείνους ἀποκριτικῆς — P. Honor. Ib. p. 198.

account of themselves; so that it was not in the  
power of the Pope, or of any others to reverse  
their Ordination; or dispossess them of their places.  
There was no confirmation importing any  
such matter: this is plain; and one instance will  
serve to shew it; that of Pope *Honorius*, and of  
*Sergius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, who speak of *So-  
phronius* Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; that he was constituted Bishop be-  
fore their knowledge, and receipt of his Synodical Letters.

9. If



9. If the designation of any Bishop should belong to the Pope, then especially that of *Metropolitans*, who are the chief Princes of the Church; but this anciently did not belong to him. In *Africk* the most ancient Bishop of the *Province* (without election) did succeed into that dignity. Where the *Metropoles* were fixed, all the Bishops of the *Province* did convene, and with the consent of the Clergy, persons of quality, and the commonalty did elect him\*. So was St. Cyprian Bishop of *Carthage* elected. So *Nectarius* of *Constantinople*, *Flavianus* of *Antioch*, and *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, as the Fathers of *Constantinople* tell us. So *Stephanus* and *Bassianus* rival Bishops of *Ephesus* did pretend to have been chosen, as we saw before.

another is to be put in his place, the Provincial Bishops ought to meet in the Metropolitan City, that by the Votes of the whole Clergy and Citizens, out of the Priests or Deacons of the same Church, the fittest person may be chosen.

And for Confirmation, there did not need any, there is no mention of any; except that Confirmation of which we spake, a consequent approbation of them from all their Fellow Bishops, as having no exception against them, rendring them unworthy of communion. In the Synod of *Chalcedon* it was defined that the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have equal Privileges with the Bishop of *Rome*; yet it is expressly cautioned there, that he shall not meddle in Ordination of Bishops in any *Province*, that being left to the *Metropolitan*—For a good time, even in the *Western* parts the Pope did not meddle with the Constitution of *Metropolitans*; leaving the Churches to enjoy their Liberties. Afterwards with all other Rights he snatched the Collation, Confirmation, &c. of *Metropolitans*.

VII. Sovereigns have a power to Censure and Correct all inferior Magistrates in proportion to their Offences: and in case of great misdemeanour or of incapacity they can wholly discharge and remove them from their Office.

This Prerogative therefore He of *Rome* doth claim as most proper to himself, by Divine Sanction.

God Almighty alone can dissolve the spiritual marriage between a Bishop and his Church—Therefore those three things premised (the Confirmation, Translation and Deposition of Bishops) are reserved to the Roman Bishop, not so much by Canonical Constitution, as by Divine Institution.

This power the Convention of *Trent* doth allow him; thwarting the ancient Laws, and betraying the Liberties of the Church thereby, and endangering the Christian Doctrine to be inflected and corrupted to the advantage of Papal Interest.

But such a power anciently did not by any Rule, or Custom in a peculiar manner belong to the Roman Bishop.

Ἐκείνους τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐπισκοπῶν, μόνον δὲ ὁ Χρ. ὁ Θεός. Const. Ap. 8. 28.

A Bishop may depose any Clerk who deserves it, except he be a Bishop, whom to deprive, one Bishop alone is not sufficient.

\* *Metropolitano defuncto, cum in locum ejus alius fuerit subrogandus, Provinciales Episcopi ad Civitatem Metropolitanam convenire debebunt, ut omnium Clericorum atque omnium Civium voluntate discussa ex Presbyteris ejusdem Ecclesie, vel ex Diaconibus optimus eligatur.* P. Leo Ep. 88.

The Metropolitan being dead, when

Μὴδὲν ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος ἔχει τὸν χειροτονία καὶ τὸ ὁσολόγου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου τὸ βασιλίδος. — Act. 16. p. 464.

Vid. Concil. Aur. Can. 7.  
Apud de Marc. VI. 4. scilicet. 8.

Vid. Gelas.  
Ep. 13.  
(p. 640.)

Id ideo tria hæc quæ præmissimus non tam Constitutione Canonica, quam Institutione Divina soli sunt Romano Pontifici reservata. P. Innoc. III. in Gregor. Decret. Lib. 1. Tit. 7. cap. 2.

Causæ criminales graves contra Episcopos, etiam hæresis quod absit, quæ depositione aut privatione dignæ sunt, ab ipso tantum summo Romano Pontifice cognoscantur, & terminentur. Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. cap. 5.

Premising what was generally touched about Jurisdiction: in reference to this Branch we remark.

Syn. Nic.  
Can. 5.

Decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos, sive ipsos Episcopos suis Metropolitanis apertissime commiserunt: prudentissime enim iustissimeque viderunt quacun- que negotia in suis locis ubi orta sunt fini- enda; nec unicuique Provincie gratiam S. Spiritus defuturam. Syn. Afr. Ep. ad P. Cels. l. I.

Syn. Ant. Can. 15.

(Ann 296.)  
Euseb. 7. 30.

Socr. 1. 24.  
ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὴν οὐνοκαταστασίαν ἡ ἕκαστος. Soz.  
2. 9.

Socr. 2. 43.

Soz. 3. 14.

Socr. 1. 36.

Socr. 2. 29.

Socr. 1. 28.

Theod. 2. 10.

Act. 11. Syn.  
Chalc. p. 411.  
Hec Scum. 4.  
jungenda.

Τίνας τε καὶ πότες καὶ διὰ τῆς ἑκκλη-  
σίας ἀκραιώσαντες ἐν στασίδι. καὶ ὅτι ἐκ-  
κλήσαντες πάντες ὅσοι ἐκ τῆς αὐθεντίας  
ἐκστάντες. P. Celest. in Nest. Sent. Eph.  
Act. p. 195.

Quod non solum præsuli Apostolico facere  
liet, sed cuicunque Pontifici, ut quilibet  
et quolibet locum secundum regulam ha-  
rescos ipsius ante damnata, a Catholica  
communionis discernant. Ep. 4.

1. The exercising of Judgment and Censure upon Bishops (when it was needful for general good) was prescribed to be done by Synods; Provincial, or Patriarchal (Diocesan.) In them Causes were to be dis- cussed, and Sentence pronounced against those who had deviated from faith, or committed misdemeanours. So it was appointed in the Sy- nod of Nice; as the African Synod (wherein St. Austin was one Bishop) did observe, and urge in their Epistle to Pope Celestine; in those no- table words, *Whether they be Clergy of an inferiour degree, or whether they*

*be Bishops, the Nicene decrees have most plainly com- mitted them to the Metropolitan's charge, for they have most prudently and justly discerned that all mat- ters whatsoever ought to be determined in the pla- ces where they do first begin; and that the grace of the holy spirit would not be wanting to every particu- lar Province. The same Law was enacted by the Synod of Antioch, by the Synods of Constantino- ple, Chalcedon, &c.*

Thus was Paulus Samosatenus for his error against the Divinity of our Lord, and for his scandalous demeanour deposed by the Synod of

Antioch. Thus was Eustathius Bishop of Antioch (being accused of Sabellianism and of other faults) removed by a Synod of the same place; the which Sentence he quietly did bear. Thus another En-

stathius Bishop of Sebastia (for his uncouth garb, and fond conceits against marriage) was discarded by the Synod of Gangra. Thus did a Synod of Constantinople abdicate Marcellus Bishop of Ancyra, for hete- rodoxy in the point concerning our Lord's Divinity. For the like cause was Photinus Bishop of Sirmium deposed by a Synod there, ga- thered by the Emperour's command. So was Athanasius tryed, and con- demned (although unjustly as to the matter and cause) by the Sy- nod of Tyre. So was St. Chrysostome (although most injuriously) de- posed by a Synod at Constantinople. So the Bishops at Antioch (according to the Emperour's order) deposed Stephanus Bishop of that place, for a wicked contrivance against the fame of Euphrates and Vincentius.

In all these Condemnations, Censures and Depositions of Bishops (whereof each was of high rank and great interest in the Church) the Bishop of Rome had no hand, nor so much as a little finger. All the proceedings did go on supposition of the Rule, and Laws, that such Judgments were to be passed by Synods.

St. Chrysostome δεσπότης Ἐπισκόπος, καὶ δούλος... Deposed fifteen Bishops.

2. In some case a kind of deposing of Bishops was assumed by par- ticular Bishops, as defenders of the Faith, and executors of Canons; their Deposition consisting in not allowing those to be Bishops, whom for erroneous Doctrine, or disorderly Behaviour (notoriously incurred) they deemed incapable of the Office, presu- ming their places, *ipso facto* void.

This Pope Gelasius I. proposed for a Rule, *That not only a Metropolitan, but every other Bishop hath a Right to separate any persons or any place from the Catholick Communion, according to the rule by which*  
his

his heresy is already condemned. And upon this account did the Popes for so long time quarrel with the See of Constantinople, because they did not expunge *Acasius* from the roll of Bishops, who had communicated with Hereticks. So did Saint *Cyprian* reject *Marcianus* Bishop of *Arles* for adhering to the *Novatians*. So *Athanasius* was said to have deposed *Arian* Bishops, and substituted others in their places. So *Acasius* and his Complices deposed *Macedonius* and divers other Bishops. And *Socr.* 2. 42. the Bishops of those times καθεύλον ἀλλήλους, factiously applying a Rule taken for granted then, deposed one another: So *Maximus* Bishop of *Jerusalem* deposed *Athanasius*. So *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* threatened to depose *Alexander* of *Constantinople*, if he would not admit *Arius* to communion. \* *Acacius* and his Complices did extrude *Maximus* Bishop of *Jerusalem*. † He also deposed and expelled *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*: \* and deposed many other Bishops at *Constantinople*. || *Cyril* deposed *Nestorius*, and *Nestorius* deposed *Cyril*, and *Memnon*. *Cyril* and *Juvenalis* deposed *John* of *Antioch*. \* *John* of *Antioch* with his Bishops deposed *Cyril* and *Memnon*. † Yea after the Synod of *Ephesus*, *John* of *Antioch*, gathering together many Bishops did depose *Cyril*. *Stephanus* concerning *Bassianus*; Because he had entered into the Church with Swords—therefore he was expelled out of it again by the holy Fathers, both by *Leo* of *Rome* the Imperial City, and by *Flavianus*; by the Bishop of *Alexandria*, and also by the Bishop of *Antioch*. *Anatolius* of *Constantinople* did reject *Timotheus* of *Alexandria*. *Acacius* Bishop of *Constantinople* did reject *Petrus Fullo*.

3. St. *Cyprian* doth assert the power of Censuring Bishops, upon needful and just occasion, to belong to all Bishops, for maintenance of common Faith, Discipline and Peace.

Therefore, (saith he, writing to Pope *Stephanus* himself) dear Brother, the body of Bishops is copious, being coupled by the glue of concord, and the band of unity, that if any of our College shall attempt to frame a heresie, to to tear and spoil the flock of Christ, the rest may succour, and like usefull and mercifull shepherds may gather together the sheep of our Lord into the flock.

The like Doctrine is that of Pope *Celestine* I. in his Epistle to the *Antiochian* Ephesine Synod.

ἐν τῇ κείνῃ ἐπιστολῇ— ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ φερνίδι συνήνυσθα εἰ πᾶσι καὶ ἐν τῇ πύσσει ἀκρίβειαν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ διαδοχῇ  
 πρὸς ἡμᾶς κρείνως κατέβη— &c. Conc. Eph. Act. 2. p. 324.  
 Τοιγαυτὶ συνεστήσαμεν ὑμῶν, καὶ παλαιῶν ὅπως καμάτω κοινῇ τῇ ἐμπειρομένῃ; καὶ διὰ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν Διαδοχὴν  
 ὡς τὴν νῦν συζήτησιν φησὶν. Ibid. p. 325.

In matter of Faith any Bishop might interpose Judgment -- *Theophilus* did proceed to condemn the *Origenists* without regard to the Pope. *Vid. Hier. 67. & 73.*

*Epiphanius* did demand satisfaction of *John* of *Jerusalem*.

4. This

Ἐπεὶ ἂν ἐχρῆτο τὸ δὴ κακοδοξία θεωρεῖσθαι κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀρχαίαν Ἐκκλησίαν, ἢ διὰ τὴν ἑκκλησίαν ὁ ὅμοιος θεωρεῖται. Conc. sub Men. (p. 10.)

Cypr. Ep. 67.

Soz. 3. 21.

Πρὸς τὸν καθεύον. Socr. 2. 24.

Εὐσεβίου πολλὰ δ. πτωλεῖ αὐτῷ, λέγοντες ὅσον ἰδέσθαι καθεύοντων αὐτῶν, εἰ μὴ εἰς κοινότητα δέχεται τὸ ἄριστον. Socr. 1. 37.

\* Εὐσεβίου. Socr. 2. 38.

† Theod. 2. 26.

\* Sozom. 4. 24.

|| Socr. 7. 34.

Κύριλλος δὲ αὐτῶν ἱεροαρχὴν ἀμυνόμενος καὶ Ἰωάννην καθεύοντα καὶ αὐτῶν. Ibid.

\* Ἡ ἐκκλησία συνήνυσεν— τῶν μὲν καθεύοντων διὰ τὴν φερνίδα πάντα, Μιμίονα δὲ ὡς συνήνυσεν αὐτῶν. Ath. Syn. Eph. p. 380.

Ὡς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἑκκλησίαν καθεύοντες ἡναγίσθησαν. Ibid. p. 310.

† Ἰωάννης δὲ καθεύοντων τῶν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ πολλὰς συναγαγόντων Ἐπισκόπους καθεύοντων Κύριλλον, ὅσην κατέλαβον τῶν Ἀλεξανδρινῶν. Socr. 7. 34.

Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ τῇ ἑκκλησίᾳ μὴ ἔφωτον— ἐξέστη διὰ τὸ ὅτι καὶ ἁγίων Πατέρων ἐξέστη τὸ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι βασιλεύοντες Ρώμης Ἀποστόλοι καὶ μακαριοὶ τῆς Φλαμίας— καὶ ὅτι τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ, καὶ ἐξέστη τῶν Ἀντιόχειαν. Syn. Chalc. Ath. 11. p. 405.

Ὁ μαρτυρῶν ἐν ἀγίοις Φλαμίας ἐξέστη αὐτῶν. Ibid. p. 406.

Baron. Ann. 457. Sect. 34.

P. Felix III. Ep. 4.

Idcirco enim, frater charissime, copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum, concordiaque mutua glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex Collegio nostro heresim facere, & gregem Christi lacerare, & vastare tentaverit, subvertimus ceteri, & quasi pastores utiles & misericordes oves Dominicas in gregem colligant. Cypr. Ep. 67. (ad Steph.)



4. This common right of Bishops in some cases is confirmed by the nature of such Censures, which consisted in disclaiming persons notoriously guilty of Heresie, Schism or Scandal; and in refusing to entertain communion with them; which every Bishop, as entitled to the common Interests of Faith and Peace, might do

[illegible]

Εἰκότως ἡμῖς ἐπιστάμενοι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ  
καρτίαν ἐν δικαιοῦ ἀρετῶν μόνον ἀρ-  
μοδίην, τὴν δὲ τὴν ὁρῶντες πίστεως ἢ μόνον ἐν-  
φανίζονται ἀλλὰ καὶ παντὶ Ὁμοδοξῶ χει-  
ριστῶ. Menas (Tom. 4. p. 10.)

*Plebs, &c.*  
*Deum meturns* — } *Cypr. Ep. 68.*

*Vid. P. Nich. I. Ep. 8. (p. 506.)*

\* Cunctis monachis ab eodem Epiph-  
nio scripta venerunt, ut absque satisfacti-  
one fidei nullus ei temere communicaret.  
Hier. Ep. 61. (ad Pammach.) cap. 15.

*Alicubine dictum, aut tibi alicubi man-  
natum est, quod sine satisfactione fidei com-  
munionem tuam subiremus? Ibid.*

Quid tibi non communicamus, fidei est.  
Ibid. cap. 16.

5. Indeed in such a case every Christian had a right (yea an obligation) to desert his own Bishop. So *John of Hierusalem* having given suspicion of Errour in Faith, \* *St. Epiphanius* did write Letters to the Monks of *Palestine* not to communicate with him, till they were satisfied of his Orthodoxy. Upon which account *St. Hierome* living in *Palestine* did decline communication with the Patriarch thereof; asking him if it were any where said to him or commanded that without satisfaction concerning his faith, they were bound to maintain communion with him. So every Bishop, yea every Christian hath a kind of Universal Jurisdiction.

6. If any Pope did assume more than was allowed in this case by the Canons, or was common to other Bishops of his rank, it was an irregularity and an usurpation. Nor would Examples, if any were producible, serve to justify them; or to ground a right thereto, any more than the extravagant proceedings of other pragmatical and factious Bishops in the same kind (whereof so many instances can be alledged) can assert such a power to any Bishop.

Theophilus,  
John of Anti-  
och, Dioscorus.

7. When the Pope hath attempted in this kind, his power hath been disavowed, as an illegal, upstart pretence.

*Novam legem,  
&c. Vid. de  
Conc. Sard.*

8. Other Bishops have taken upon them, when they apprehended cause, to discard and depose Popes. So did the *Oriental Faction* at *Sardica* depose Pope *Julius* for transgressing, as they supposed, the Laws of the Church, in fostering hereticks, and criminal persons condemned by Synods. So did the Synod of *Antioch* threaten Deposition to the same Pope. So did the Patriarch *Dioscorus* make shew to reject Pope *Leo* from communion. So did St. *Hilary* anathematize Pope *Liberius*.

Soz. 3. 11.

Soz. 3. 8.

Evag. 2. 4.

**Hilar. fragm**

9. Popes, when there was great occasion, and they had a great mind to exert their utmost power, have not yet presumed by themselves, *without joint authority of Synods*, to condemn Bishops; so Pope *Julius* did not presume to depose *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, his great Adversary, and so much obnoxious by his patronizing *Arianism*.

An qui in hominem Imperatorem peccasse dicebatur, nullâ interveniente Synodo deijci debuerunt? P. Gelaf. I. Ep. 18.

Pope *Innocent* did not censure *Theophilus* and his Complices, who so irregularly and wrongfully had extruded *St. Chrysostome*, although much displeased with them; but endeavoured to get a General Synod to doe the business. Pope *Leo I.* (although a man of spirit and animosity sufficient) would not, without assistance of a Synod attempt to judge *Dioscorus*, who had so highly provoked him, and given so much advantage against him, by favouring *Entyches*, and persecuting the Orthodox.

Indeed often we may presume that Popes would have deposed Bishops, if they had thought it regular, or if others commonly had received that opinion, so that they could have expected success in their attempting it.

But

But they many times were angry when their horns were short, and shewed their teeth when they could not bite.

10. What has been done in this kind by Popes jointly with others, or in Synods, (especially upon advantage, when the cause was just and plausible) is not to be ascribed to the authority of Popes as such. It might be done with their influence, not by their authority: so the Synod of *Sardica* (not Pope *Julius*) cashiered the enemies of *Athanasius*; so the Synod of *Chalcedon* (not Pope *Leo*) deposed *Dioscorus*; so the *Roman* Synod (not Pope *Celestine*) checked *Nestorius*; and that of *Ephesus* deposed him. The whole *Western* Synod (whereof he was President) had a great sway.

Ἡ ἀγία Ρω-  
μαίων σύνοδος  
καὶ τὴν τε-  
ραστὴν Cyril.  
ad Job. Ant.  
Cons. Eph.—  
p. 197. 332.  
Syn. p. 11, 60.  
in Syn. VI. p. 11.  
Ibid p. 60.

Ἀποστολὴς, ὅθεν, καὶ ἡ σύνοδος αὐτῆς. Const. Sacra. in Syn. VI. p. 11.  
Ἀποστολὴς καὶ τὴν σύνοδον. Ath. Eph. p. 332.  
Sit hac in te fixa damnatio à me, & ab his qui sub me constituti Episcopales Sedes gubernare noscuntur—  
P. Felix. ad Petrum Antiochi, apud Baron. Ann. 483. Sect. 68.

11. If Instances were arguments of Right, there would be other pretenders to the deposing power. Particular Bishops would have it, as we before shewed.

12. The People would have the power; for they have sometimes deposed Popes themselves, with effect.

So of Pope *Constantine Platina* telleth us, at length he is deposed by the people of *Rome*, being very much provoked by the indignity of the matter.

Tandem à Se-  
de deicitur à  
populo Romano  
irâ & indignitate rei preito. Plat. p. 223. P. Leo VIII. p. 291. Anastasius Plat. p. 131.

13. There are many Instances of Bishops being removed or deposed by the Imperial authority. This power was indeed necessarily annexed to the Imperial dignity; for all Bishops being Subjects of the Emperour, he could dispose of their persons, so as not to suffer them to continue in a place, or to put them from it, as they demeaned themselves, to his satisfaction or otherwise, in reference to publick utility. It is reasonable, if they were disloyal or disobedient to him, that he should not suffer them to be in places of such influence, whereby they might pervert the people to disaffection. It is fit that he should deprive them of temporalities.

The example of *Solomon* deposing *Abiathar*.

*Constantine M.* \* commanded *Eusebius* and *Theogonius* to depart out of the Cities over which they presided as Bishops.

2 Kings 1. 35.  
Εὐσεβίου καὶ  
Θεογονίου ἐξ-  
εἶναι ἀπὸ τῶν  
πόλεων αἱς ὑπε-  
τάσσοντο.

αὐτῶν πόλεις. Soz. 1. 21. Τότε αὐτῷ ἐπε-  
λάλησεν, καὶ τὸ πλεον ἐξήλαθ' αὐτοῦ.  
\* He threatened *Athanasius* to depose him—  
ἐάν τις γὰρ αὐτῷ κακώλουντος πινὰς αὐτῷ  
ἢ ἀπειρῶντος ἢ ἐπιδόντος, ἀποστελῶ πρὸς αὐτὸν  
τὸ ἐκδιώξαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν πό-  
λεων αἱς ὑπετάσσοντο. Theodor. 1. 20.  
Socr. 1. 27. Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 778.

*Constantinus* deposed *Paulus* of *Constantinople*.

*Constantinus* ejected all that would not subscribe to the Creed of *Ariminum*.

Τὸν Παῦλον  
ἐξέλαβ' ἐκ τῆς  
πόλεως. Socr. 2. 7.  
τὴν δὲ ἐκδιώξαι  
τὸ ἀναρροῦντι-  
νόν. Socr. 2. 37.

αὐτὸν ἐπειρῶν πείσας ἐκέλευσεν εἰς τὰς πόλεις Ἰταλίας Ἐκκλησίας ἐκπέμπεσθαι, περὶ τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῶν πό-  
λεων αὐτῶν, ἐξελῶντι τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἐπίστρες ἀντιπροσέταξαι. Socr. 2. 37.

The Emperour *Leo* deposed *Timotheus Aelurus*, for which Pope *Leo* did highly commend and thank him.

Evag. 2. 11.  
Lib. cap. 151.  
P. Leo I.  
Epi. 99.

The Emperours discarded divers Popes.

*Constantinus* banished Pope *Liberius*, and caused another to be put in his room.





St. Cyprian also (if we mark it) covertly doth tax the Pope of negligence, in not having soon enough joined with himself and the community of Bishops in censuring that Delinquent.

We may add, that the Church of Arles and Gaul, being near Italy, the Pope may be allowed to have some greater sway there, than otherwise in more distant places; so that St. Cyprian thought his Letters to quicken Discipline there, might be proper and particularly effectual.

These things being duly considered, what advantage can they draw from this Instance? doth it not rather prejudice their cause, and afford a considerable objection against it?

We may observe, that the strength of their argumentation mainly consisteth in the words *quibus abstento*, the which (as the drift of the whole Epistle, and parallel expressions therein do shew) do signifie no more, than *quibus efficiatur ut abstento*, which may procure him to be excommunicated, not *que contineant abstentionem*, which contain excommunication, as P. de Marca glosseth; although admitting that sense, it would not import much, seeing only thereby the Pope would have signified his consent with other Bishops; wherefore de Marca hath no great cause to blame us, that we do not deprehend any magnificent thing in this place for the dignity of the Papal See; indeed he hath, I must confess, better eyes than I, who can see any such mighty things there for that purpose.

As for the substitution of another in the room of Marcianus, that was a consequent of the excommunication; and was to be the work of the Clergy and people of the place; for when by common judgment of Catholick Bishops any Bishop was rejected, the people did apply themselves to chuse another.

I adjoin the Resolution of a very learned writer of their communion, in these words,

In this case of Marcianus Bishop of Arles, if the right of excommunication did belong solely to the Bishop of Rome, wherefore did Faustinus Bishop of Lyons advertise Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, who was so far distant, concerning those very things touching Marcianus, which both Faustinus himself, and other Bishops of the same Province, had before sent word of to Stephen (Bishop of Rome) who lived nearest, being moreover of all Bishops the chief? It must either be said that this was done because of Stephen's negligence; or what is more probable, according to the discipline then used in the Church, that all Bishops of neighbouring places, but especially those presiding over the most eminent Cities, should join their Counsels for the welfare of the Church, and that Christian Religion might not receive the least damage in any of its affairs whatsoever: Hence it was that in the case of Marcianus Bishop of Arles, the Bishop of Lyons writ Letters to the Bishop of Rome and Carthage; and again, that the Bishop of Carthage, as being most remote, did write to the Bishop of Rome as being his brother and Colleague, who by reason of his propinquity might more easily know and judge of the whole matter.

In hoc Marciani Episcopi Arelatensis causa si jus abstinenti sive excommunicandi competebat soli Episcopo Romano, cur Faustinus Episcopus Lugdunensis Cypriano Episcopo Carthaginiensi longe distico, smel atque iterum significat ea de Marciano, que jam utique ipse Faustinus & alii ejusdem Provincia Episcopi nunciaverant Stephano proximiori, & omnium Episcoporum principi? Dicendum igitur factum id fuisse aut per negligentiam Stephani; aut quod magis videtur, per disciplinam que tunc in Ecclesia vigeat, ut omnes quidem in circumpositis locis, sed præsertim Urbium clarissimarum Episcopi in communis consulerent Ecclesie, viderentque ne quid detrimenti res Christiana Catholica caperet. Itaque super isto Marciani Arelatensis facinore, Lugdunensem Episcopum ad Romanum & Carthaginiensem dedisse literas, istum vero ut remotissimum dedisse vidissim suæ ad Romanum, ut patrem & Collegam, qui in propinquo facilius posset de negotio & cognoscere & statuere. Rigalt. in Cyp. Ep. 67.

The other Instances are of a later date (after the Synod of Nice) and therefore of not so great weight; yea their having none more an-

cient to produce, doth strongly make against the antiquity of this right; it being strange, that no memory should be of any deposed thereby for above three hundred years, but however such as they are, they do not reach home to the purpose.

They alledge *Flavianus* Bishop of *Antioch* deposed by Pope *Damasus*, as they affirm. But it is wonderful they should have the face to men-

Τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου χαλεπαίνον-  
Theod.

Theod. 5. 23.  
Socr. 5. 15.  
Soz. 8. 3.

tion that Instance; the story in short being this, *The Great Flavianus* (a most worthy and Orthodox Prelate, whom *St. Chrysostome* in his Statuary Orations doth so highly commend and celebrate) being substituted in the place of *Meletius* by the Quire of Bishops; a party did adhere to *Paulinus*; and after his decease they set up *Evaagrius*, ordaining him (as *Theodoret*, who was best acquainted with passages on that side of Christendom, reporteth) against many Canons of the Church.

Αλλ' ὅμως τότεν ἴδεν εἶναι θύλον  
τὴν Εὐαγρίου μὲν κοινονίαν ἵστασθαι, καὶ  
Φλαβιανὸν τοῖς βασιλεὺς ἐκλήσαναι ἀποδοῦναι.  
Theod. 16.

Yet with this party, the Roman Bishops, not willing to know any of these things, (three of them in order, *Damasus*, *Siricius*, *Anastasius*) did conspire, instigating the Emperour against *Flavianus*, and reproaching him as supporter of a Tyrant against the Laws of Christ.

But the Emperour having called *Flavianus* to him, and received much satisfaction in his demeanour and discourse, did demand and set-

Αὐτῷ δὲ τὴν ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν  
θαυμάσας ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ἐπιστάντων τοῦ  
τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἐξελθόντων ποιμαίνον  
Ἐκκλησίαν ἐκέλευσε. Theod. 16.

tle him in his place; *The Emperour* (saith *Theodoret*) wondring at his courage and his wisdom, did command him to return home, and to feed the Church committed to him; at which proceeding when the Romans afterward did grumble, the Emperour gave them such reasons and advices that they complied and did entertain communion with *Flavianus*.

It is true, that upon their suggestions and clamours, the Emperour was moved at first to order that *Flavianus* should go to Rome, and give the Western Bishops satisfaction: but after that he understood the quality of his plea, he freed him of that trouble, and without their allowance settled him in his See.

Here is nothing of the Pope's deposing *Flavianus*; but of his embracing in a Schism the side of a Competitour, it being in such a case needful that the Pope or any other Bishop should chuse with whom he must communicate, and consequently must disclaim the other; in which choice the Pope had no good success; not deposing *Flavianus*, but vainly opposing him; wherefore this allegation is strangely impertinent, and well may be turned against them.

Indeed in this Instance, we may see how fallible that See was in their judgment of things, how rash in taking parties and fomenting discords; how pertinacious in a bad cause, how peevish against the common sense of their brethren; (especially considering, that before this opposition of *Flavianus* the Fathers of *Constantinople* had in their Letter to Pope *Damasus* and the Occidental Bishops approved, and commended him to them; highly asserting the legitimation of his Ordination;) In fine, how little their authority did avail with wise and conside-

Theod. 5. 9.

οἷτε τὸ  
τοῦ ἱεροῦ  
ἀνατολῆς

δικαιώσεως συνδεδεμένους κατενικῶς ἐχρηστούμεται— ἡμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς χρεώμεθα ἐνδεῶς καὶ τὸ ὁ σὺ νόθε ποιῶν.

Socr. 5. 15.  
Marc. 3. 14.  
Sect. 1.

*De Merca* representeth the matter somewhat otherwise out of *Socrates*; but take the matter as *Socrates* hath it and it signifieth no more, than that both *Theophilus* and *Damasus* would not entertain communion with

with *Flavianus*, as being incapable of the Episcopal Order, for having violated his Oath and caused a division in the Church of *Antioch*: what is this to judicial Deposition? and how did *Damasus* more depose him than *Theophilus*, who upon the same dissatisfaction did in like manner forbear communion? whenas indeed a wiser and better man than either of them, *St. Chrysostome*, did hold communion with him, and did at length (saith *Socrates*, not agreeing with *Theodoret*) reconcile him to them both.

They alledge the Deposition of *Nestorius*. But who knoweth not, that he was for heretical Doctrine deposed in and by a General Synod? \*Pope *Celestine* did indeed threaten to withdraw his communion, if he did not renounce his error. But had not any other Bishop sufficient authority to desert a perverter of the faith? †Did not his own Clergy doe the same, being commended by Pope *Celestine* for it? ||Did not *Cyril* in writing to Pope *Celestine* himself affirm, that he might before have declared, that he could not communicate with him? Did *Nestorius* admit the Pope's judgment? no, as the Papal Legates did complain, \*He did not admit the constitution of the Apostolical Chair. Did the Pope's Sentence obtain effect? No, not any; for notwithstanding his threats, *Nestorius* did hold his place till the Synod; the Emperour did severely rebuke *Cyril* for his fierceness, (and implicitly the Pope) and did order that no change should be made, till the Synod should determine in the case; not regarding the Pope's judgment: So that this instance may well be retorted, or used to prove the insignificancy of Papal authority then.

They alledge also *Diſcornus* of *Alexandria* deposed by Pope *Leo*: but the case is very like to that of *Nestorius*, and argueth the contrary to what they intend; He was, for his misdemeanours, and violent countenancing of heresie, solemnly in a General Synod accused, tried, condemned and deposed; the which had long before been done, if in the Pope, his professed and provoked Adversary, there had been sufficient power to effect it.

*Bellarmino* also alledgeth Pope *Sixtus* III. deposing *Polycronius* Bishop of *Jerusalem*: But no such *Polycronius* is to be found in the Registers of Bishops then, or in the Histories of that busie time, between the two great Synods of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*; and the Acts of *Sixtus*, upon which this allegation is grounded, have so many inconsistencies, and smell so rank of forgery, that no conscionable nose could endure them; and any prudent man (as *Binius* himself confesseth) would assert them to be spurious. Wherefore *Baronius* himself doth reject and despise them; who gladly would lose no advantage for his Master. Yet Pope *Nicholas* I. doth precede *Bellarmino* in citing this trash; no wonder, that being the Pope, who did avouch the wares of *Isidore Mercator*.

They alledge *Timothens* the Usurper of *Alexandria* deposed by Pope *Damasus*; and they have indeed the sound of words attesting to them; These are Heads upon which the B. *Damasus* deposed the Hereticks *Apolinaris*, *Vitalius* and *Timothens*.

\* Γνωστέον ὅτι αὐτὸς τὸν πατριάρχην κωνσταντίνον ἔχεν ἐν δυνάμει, ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ  
P. Celest. ad Cyril. in Conc. Eph. Act. p. 181.

Πατριάρχης ὑπὸ τῷ συνάξει τῶν ἐκείνῃ χειρουργῶν συνόδῳ ἀποκαταστάσας ἐὰν μὴ ἐνδεῖας τὰ κακῶς ἐκτελέσθαι ὑπὸ τῷ διορθωτῇ. Ibid. Epist. ad Nest. p. 186.

\* Ἀπὸ τῶν πατριάρχων κωνσταντίας ἀποκαταστάσας. (ad Joh. Ant. p. 196.)

† Μακροῦ ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, ὁ πατριάρχης ὁ κωνσταντίνου καὶ ὁ ἰδίας νομῆς. P. Celest. ad Clerum, &c. Const. Act. Eph. p. 190.

|| Ἐγὼ δὲ ὁμολογῶ καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συννοητικῶς ὑπομνήσας φανερὸν αὐτῷ κατεστάσας; ὅτι ταῦτα λέγουσι καὶ φερόμεναι κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ διορθωτῇ. Cyril. Ep. and Celest. Act. Epist. p. 177.

\* Τὸν τὸν τὸν Ἀποτολίμης κατεστάσας ἐκ ἐκείνων. Conc. Eph. Act. 3. p. 331. Vid. Theodof. 2. Epist. in Conc. Eph. p. 224, & 225.

Baron. Ann. 433. Sect. 38. 39. P. Nich. I. Epist. 8. (ad Mich.)

Fac. Herm. p. 150.

Ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κεφάλαια ἐφ' οἷς ὁ πατριάρχης Δαμασκός κατέθελεν Ἀπολινάριον καὶ Βιτάλιον καὶ Τιμόθεον τοὺς αἰρετικούς. Orig. ad Rurum. apud Bin. p. 356.

The



The truth is, that *Apolinarius*, with divers of his Disciples, in a great Synod at *Rome*, at which *Petrus* Bishop of *Alexandria* together with *Damasus* was present, was condemned and disavowed for heretical Doctrine; whence *Sozomen* saith that the *Apolinarian Heresie* was by *Damasus* and *Peter*, at a Synod in *Rome*, voted to be excluded from the *Catholic Church*.

On which account if we conclude that the Pope had an authority to depose Bishops, we may by like reason infer that every Patriarch and Metropolitan had a power to doe the like; there being so many Instances of their having condemned and disclaimed Bishops supposedly guilty of heresie; as particularly *John* of *Antioch*, with his convention of *Oriental Bishops*, did pretend to depose *Cyril* and *Memnon* as guilty of the same *Apolinarian* heresie; alledging that to exscind them was the same thing as to settle *Orthodoxy*. The which Deposition was at first admitted by the Emperour.

Μαθὼν ἔν ταύτῃ τῷ αἵρεσιν ἐκ πλ-  
ρῆς ἐρπυν ἡρετῆς Δάμασος ὁ Ῥωμαίων  
ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Πέτρος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας,  
συνεδρῶν ὁ οὐκ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀλλ' ἐν ὀλίγῃ τῇ  
ἐκείνῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐψηφίσαντο. Soz. 6. 25.

Τὸ δὲ πέρας  
ἐκ τῶν ὁσίων  
ἐπερὶ δὲ τῇ  
ὀρθοδοξίᾳ ἐν  
συνῇ. Relat. Orient. ad Imp. in Aeth. Eph. p. 380. Ὁ δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ συνεδρίῳ ὡς ἐν ὀλίγῃ ἡμεῖς Νεστωρί-  
ος Κορινθίου καὶ Μιχαὴλ ἐκδιέστην ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Aeth. p. 385.

Ann. 536.  
Vid. Tun.

The next Instance is of Pope *Agapetus* (in *Justinian's* time, for so deep into time is *Bellarmino* fain to dive for it) deposing *Anthimus* Bishop of *Constantinople*. But this Instance being scanned will also prove slender and lame. The case was this: *Anthimus* having deserted his charge at *Tnabifonde* did creep into the See of *Constantinople* (a course then held irregular and repugnant to the Canons) and withall he had imbibed the *Eutychian* heresie. Yet for his support he had wound himself

\* Evag. 4. 10.

into the favour of the Emperess *Theodora*, \* a countenancer of the *Eutychian* Sect. Things standing thus, Pope *Agapetus* (as an Agent from *Rome* to crave succour against the *Goths* pressing and menacing the City) did arrive at *Constantinople*. Whereupon the Emperess desired of him to salute and consort with *Anthimus*. But he, by petitions of the Monks, &c. understanding how things stood, did refuse to doe so, except *Anthimus* would return to his own charge, and profess the *Orthodox doctrine*. Thereupon the Emperour joined with him to extrude *Anthimus* from *Constantinople*, and to substitute *Menas*. He (say the Monks in their Libel of request to the Emperour) did justly thrust this *Anthimus* from the Episcopal Chair of this City; your Grace affording aid and force both to the *Catholic faith*, and the *divine Canons*. The act of *Agapetus* was (according to his share in the common Interest) to declare *Anthimus* in his judgment incapable of *Catholic communion* and of *Episcopal Function* by

Denique petentiſſimæ Principibus, ut Anthimum Papa in ſalutacione & communicatione ſuſciperet; ille fieri inquit poſſe, ſi ſe libello probaret orthodoxum, & ad Cathedralam ſuam reverteretur. Lib. c. 21.

Τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἀποστομὴν τοῦ ἀν-  
τιμου μαθὼν — Libell. Monach. p. 7.  
Ἀλλὰ τῶν δικαίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῶν δὲ  
τῶν πόλεως ἐκ τῆς ὁρθοδόξου συντηρητικῆς  
καὶ σωτηρικῆς τῆς καθολικῆς πίστεως καὶ  
τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίον ἐκτελέσει-  
ας — Ib.

Et. Syn. decr. p. 43.  
Imper. Sanct. p. 128.

Ἀποφασισμὸς — μὲν τῇ καθολικῇ μί-  
τῃ ἐκείνῃ αὐτὸν ἐχέειν τὸ ὄνομα. Synodi  
Decr. p. 43.

reason of his heretical Opinions, and his transgression of Ecclesiastical Orders; which moved *Justinian* effectually to depose, and extrude him; *Ton* (say they) fulfilling that which he justly and canonically did judge, and by your general edict confirming it; and forbidding that hereafter such things should be attempted — And *Agapetus* himself saith \* that it was done by the *Apostolical authority* and the assistance of the most faithful Emperours. The which proceeding was com-

Τὰ ἐν παρ' ἐκείνῃ δικαιοῦς καὶ κανονικῶς  
κατεμείβετο παρρησιαστικῶς καὶ διὰ τῆς ἰσχυρῆς ἐντολῆς  
νομιστικῆς κυριότητος καὶ τῶν ταύτων τῶν  
λοιπῶν τοῦ αἵματος ἀπαγορεύοντες —

\* Τῆς δὲ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει καθέδρας  
τῷ ὄντι βουδῶντος τῶν οὐκ ἐν τῇ Ἀπο-  
στολικῇ αὐθεντίᾳ, καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸν βασι-  
λέως τῇ βοήθειᾳ διορθωτικῇ. p. 24.

pleted by Decree of the Synod under *Menas*, and that again was confirmed

firmed by the Imperial Sanction. Whence *Evagrius* reporting the story, doth say concerning *Anthimus* and *Theodosius* of *Alexandria*, that because they did cross the Emperor's commands, and did not admit the decrees of *Chalcedon*, they both were expelled from their Sees.

Ὅμως δ' ὡς ἀντικρὺ τῷ (ἡ ἀντι-  
τῷ) βασιλικῷ κελεύσματι ἰσχυρῶς καὶ μὴ  
δυσχεμενοὶ τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδονί συνήθηται· τὰ  
ἀμφοτέρωθεν δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐξελικτικὴν ἐξέλιξιν.  
Evag. 4. 11.

It seemeth by some passages in the *Acts*, that before *Agapetus* his intermeddling, \* the Monks and † Orthodox Bishops had condemned \* p. 10. † p. 16. and rejected *Anthimus*; according to the common Interest, which they assert all Christians to have in regard to the common Faith.

As for the substitution of *Menas* it was performed by the choice and suffrage of the Emperor, the Clergy, Nobles, and People conspiring; the Pope only (which another Bishop might have done) ordaining or consecrating him; Then (saith *Liberatus*) the Pope by the Emperor's favour did ordain *Menas* Bishop, consecrating him with his hand.

Καὶ ἐκλογῇ καὶ ψήφῳ τῶν συνθε-  
σάντων ἡρώδῃ βασιλεὺς, καὶ τῷ εὐαγγέλιῳ  
καὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ· Ἐκκλησίᾳ κληρονομία.

Tunc Papa Principis favore Menam pro eo  
ordinavit Antistitem, consecrans cum manu  
sua — Lib. cap. 21.

Ὁππότε τῷ γαλλωποτάτῳ βασιλεὺς ἐπι-  
γέλασεν ὁ ἐπιστολῇ — Act. p. 24.

And *Agapetus* did glory in this, as being the first Ordination made of an Eastern Bishop by the hands of a Pope: And this (saith the Pope) we conceive doth add to his dignity, because the Eastern Church never since the time of the Apostle Peter did receive any Bishop besides him by the imposition of hands of those who sate in this our Chair.

Καὶ τὸτο ὃ πρῶτον τῷ αὐτῷ ἀξία  
φρονεῖν, ἐπὶ πρῶτῳ καὶ τῷ κερμένῳ τῷ Ἀπο-  
στόλῃ Πέτρῳ ἵδμεν ἄλλοις ἐπαδόντες· Ἐκ-  
κλησίᾳ Ἀνατολικῇ ἡ Νέστορ· Ἐπιστολῇ τῇ  
καὶ τῇ ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησίας χειροτονία.  
ὁπωπ — p. 24.

If we compare the Proceedings of *Agapetus* against *Anthimus* with those of *Theophilus* against *St. Chrysostome*; they are (except the cause and qualities of persons) in all main respects and circumstances so like, that the same reason, which would ground a pretence of Universal Jurisdiction to one, would infer the same to the other.

*Baronius* alledgeth *Acacius* Bishop of *Constantinople* deposed by Pope *Felix III.* But Pope *Gelasius* asserteth, that any Bishop might, in execution of the Canons, have disclaimed *Acacius*, as a favourer of Hereticks. And *Acacius* did not onely refuse to submit to the Pope's Jurisdiction, but slighted it. And the Pope's act was but an attempt, not effectual; for *Acacius* dyed in possession of his See.

Baron. Ann. 484. Sect. 19.  
Vid. P. Felic. III. Ep. 6.  
P. Gelas. Ep. 4.

Ad cujus præcipue vocatus examen vel  
vivere vel mittere non curavit. Gelas.  
Ep. 13.

VIII. If Popes were Sovereigns of the Church, they could effectually, whenever they should see it just and fit, \* absolve— restore any Bishop excommunicated from the Church, or deposed from his Office by Ecclesiastical Censure; for Relief of the Oppressed, or Clemency to the Distressed, are noble Flowers in every Sovereign Crown.

\* When a Bishop was unjustly censured upon malice or mistake.— when he did repent of his error or miscarriage.— when the case would upon any account bear favour or Pity.—

Wherefore the Pope doth assume this power, and reserveth it to himself as his special Prerogative; 'Tis, says *Baronius*, a privilege of the Church of Rome onely, that a Bishop deposed by a Synod, may without another Synod of a greater number be restor'd by the Pope; and Pope *Gelasius I.* says, That the See of Saint Peter the Apostle has a right of loosing whatever the Sen-

Privilegium quidem solius Ecclesie Romana esse reperitur, ut depositus a Synodo Episcopus absque alia Synodo majoris numeri restitui possit per Romanum Pontificem. Baron. Ann. 449. Sect. 127.

Quorumlibet Sententiis ligata Pontificum Sedes B. Petri Apostoli jus habet resolvendi. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 13.

tences

*Sedes Apostolica frequenter more majorum, etiam sine ulla Synodo precedente & absolvendi quos Synodus iniquè damnaverat, & damnandi nullà existente Synodo quos oportuit habuit facultatem— Ibid.*

tences of other Bishops have bound— That the Apostolick See, according to frequent ancient custome, had a power, no Synod preceding, to absolve those whom a Synod had unjustly condemned, and without a Council to condemn those who deserv'd it.

It was an old pretence of Popes, that Bishops were not condemned, except the Pope did consent, renouncing communion with them.

— Qui licet violenter exclusi sunt, non tamen pro damnatis sunt habiti, id quod semper inviolatam eorum communionem Rom. Pontifices servaverunt. P. Vigilius in Constit. Athan. &c.

So Pope Vigilius saith of St. Chrysostome and Flavianus, that although they were violently excluded, yet were they not look'd upon as condemned, because the Bishops of Rome always inviolably kept communion with them.

— Quem (Johannem Chrys.) Sedes Apostolica etiam sola, quia non consensit, absolvit. P. Gelas. Ep. 3.

And before him Pope Gelasius saith, that the Pope by not consenting to the condemnation of Athanasius, Chrysostome, Flavianus, did absolve them.

But such a power of old did not belong to him. For,

1. There is not extant any ancient Canon of the Church, nor apparent footsteps of custome allowing such a power to him.

2. Decrees of Synods (Provincial in the former times, and Diocesan afterwards) were inconsistent with, or repugnant to such a power, for judgments concerning Episcopal Causes were deemed irrevocable, and appointed to be so by Decrees of divers Synods; and consequently no power was reserved to the Pope of thwarting them by Restitution of any Bishop condemned in them.

Can. Apost. 10, 11, 12, 13.  
Cone. Nic. Can. 5. Sard. 16, 17.  
Cod. Afr. 9. Conc. Antioch. 6, 15.  
Evag. 2. 4.

reservation of power

Damnati hominis communionem pollutus, damnationis ejus factus est particeps. P. Gelas. Ep. 13. (p. 640.)

3. The Apostolical Canons (which at least serve to prove or illustrate ancient Custome) and divers Synodical Decrees did prohibit entertaining communion with any person condemned or rejected by canonical Judgment; without exception, or Pope Gelasius himself says, That he who had polluted himself by holding communion with a condemned person, did partake of his condemnation.

4. Whence in elder times Popes were opposed and checked when they offered to receive Bishops rejected in particular Synods. So St. Cyprian declared the Restitution of Basilides by Pope Stephanus to be null. So the Fathers of the Antiochene Synod did reprehend Pope Julius for admitting Athanasius and Marcellus to communion, or avowing them for Bishops, after their condemnation by Synods. And the Oriental Bishops of Sardica did excommunicate the same Pope for communicating with the same persons. Which Instances do shew, that the Pope was not then undoubtedly, or according to common opinion endowed with such a power.

Cypr. Ep. 68.

But whereas they do alledge some Instances of such a power, I shall premise some general Considerations apt to clear the business, and then apply answers to the particular Allegations.

1. Restitution commonly doth signifie no more, than acknowledging a person (although rejected by undue Sentence) to be *de jure* worthy of communion, and capable of the Episcopal Office; upon which may be consequent an Obligation to communicate with him, and to allow him his due Character; according to the Precept of

<sup>a</sup> Tim. 2. 22. Saint Paul, follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace with them that call upon the Lord with a pure heart.

This



This may be done, when any man notoriously is persecuted for the Truth and Righteousness. Or when the iniquity and malice of pretended judges are apparent, to the oppression of Innocence. Or when the Process is extremely irregular: as in the cases of *Athanasius*, of *St. Chrysostome*,—And this is not an act of Jurisdiction, but of Equity and Charity; incumbent on all Bishops: and there are promiscuous Instances of Bishops practising it. Thus *Socrates*

saith, that *Maximus* Bishop of *Jerusalem* did restore communion and dignity to *Athanasius*. And so *Cyril* of *Alexandria* and *John* of *Antioch*, being reconciled and reduced to a good understanding of each other, did restore to each other their Sees; rescinding the Censures, which in heat they had denounced each on other. Which sheweth that Restitution is not always taken for an act of Jurisdiction; wherein one is Superiour to another; for those persons were in rank and power co-ordinate.

2. Restitution sometime doth import no more than a considerable influence toward the effects of restoring a person to communion or Office; no judicial act being exercised about the case—*The Emperour* writing that *Paulus* and *Athanasius* should be restored to their Sees, availed nothing—That was a Restitution without effect.

Thus a Popes avowing the Orthodoxy, or Innocence, or Worth of a person, after a due information about them, (by reason of the Pope's eminent rank in the Church, and the regard duly had to him) might sometimes much conduce to restore a person; and might obtain the name of Restitution, by an ordinary scheme of speech.

3. Sometimes persons said to be restored by Popes are also said to be restored by Synods, with regard to such instance or testimony of Popes in their behalf. In which case the Judicial Restitution, giving right of Recovery and completion thereto, was the act of the Synod.

Synods for the Restitution of a Bishop, I restore: *Vid. Conc. Chalc. Act. 1. p. 165.* That is, I give my Vote for his Restitution.

4. When Cases were driven to a legal debate, Popes could not effectually resolve without a Synod, their single acts not being held sufficiently valid. So notwithstanding the Declarations of Pope *Julius* in favour of *Athanasius*, for the effectual resolution of his case the great Synod of *Sardica* was convened. So whatever Pope *Innocent I.* did endeavour, he could not restore *St. Chrysostome* without a General Synod.

Nor could Pope *Leo* restore *Flavianus*, deposed in the Second *Ephesine* Synod, without convocation of a General Synod, the which he did so often sue for to the Emperour *Theodosius*, for that purpose. Pope *Simplicius* affirmed, that *Petrus Mogus* having been by a common decree condemned as an adulterer (or Usurper of the *Alexandrian* See) could not without a common Council be freed from condemnation.

5. Particular instances do not ascertain right to the Person who assumeth any power; for busie-bodies often will exceed their bounds.

6. Emperours did sometimes restore Bishops. *Constantine* as he did banish *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* and others, so he did revoke and restore them; so says *Socrates*, They were recall'd from banishment by the Emperour's command and receiv'd their Churches. *Theodosius* did assert to *Flavianus* his right, whereof the Popes did pretend to deprive him; which did amount to a Restitution (at

Ἀποδίδωσι καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κειρανίαν Ἀθανάσιον καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. *Socr. 2. 24.*

Ἀλλήλους τοὺς ἐπίσκοποι ἀπέδοσαν. *Socr. 7. 31.*

Γράψαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὅστε ἀποδοῦναι καὶ Παύλον καὶ Ἀθανάσιον τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ πᾶσι ἐκείναις ἐκκλησίαις. *Socr. 2. 20.*

Operabat communi decreto dimittitur tanquam adulterum communi concilio damnatione liberari. *Lib. c. 18.*

Ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκ βασιλικῆς παραγγελίας καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέλαβον. *Socr. 1. 14.*  
*Theod. 5. 23.*

least to the Romanists who do assert *Flavianus* to be deposed by the Popes.) *Instantinus* and *Priscillianus* were by the rescript of the Emperour *Gratianus* restored to their Churches. *Justinian* did order Pope *Silverius* to be restored, in case he could prove his Innocence.

*Rescriptum edicunt, quæ valentis quæ prius decreta erant, restitui Ecclesiis jubebantur: hac freti Instantinus & Priscillianus petiverunt Hispaniar. Sulp. Sev. 2. 63. Revocari Roman Silverium iussit, & de literis illis iudicium fieri, — ut si falsæ fuissent probata, restitueretur sedis sue Liberat. Breviar. cap. 22.*

7. Commonly Restitution was not effectual without the Emperour's consent; whence *Theodoret*, although allowed by the great Synod, did acknowledge his Restitution especially due to the Emperour; as we shall see in reflecting on his case.

Now to the particular Instances produced for the Pope, we answer.

1. They pretend, that Pope *Stephanus* did restore *Basilides* and *Martialis* Spanish Bishops, who had been deposed; for which they quote *St. Cyprian's* Epistle, where he says, *Basilides* going to Rome imposed upon our Colleague *Stephen*, who lived a great way off and was ignorant of the truth of the matter; seeking unjustly to be restored to his Bishoprick from which he had justly been deposed.

*Romam pergens Stephanum Collegam nostrum longe positum, & gesta rei ac tacite veritatis ignarum fefellit, ut excommunicaret reponi se injuste in Episcopatum, de quo fuerat justè depositus. Cyp. Ep. 68.*

But we answer; The Pope did attempt such a Restitution by way of Influence and testimony, not of Jurisdiction; wherefore the result of

— quare etsi aliqui de Collegis nostris extiterunt, qui Deificam disciplinam negligendam putant —

(Nec censura congruit Sacerdotum mobilis atque inconstantis animi levitate reprehendi. Cyp. Ep. 55.)

— Episcopatum gerere, & Sacerdotium Dei administrare non oportere.

Desideratis solitudinem vestram vel solatio vel auxilio sententia nostra sublevari.

Nec personam in ejusmodi rebus accipere, aut aliquid cuiquam largiri potest humana indulgentia; ubi intercedit & legem tribuit divina præscriptio.

— quantum possumus adhortamur, ne vos cum profanis & maculatis Sacerdotibus communicatione sacrilegè misceratis.

Sed cur ad Cyprianum si potestas infinita penes Romanum? Rigalt. ibid.

— datis ad Cyprianum literis appellavere Carthaginensem adversus Romanum. Id.

his act in *St. Cyprian's* judgment was null, and blameable; which could not be so deemed, if he had acted as a judge; for a favourable Sentence, passed by just Authority, is valid, and hardly liable to Censure. The Clergy of those places, notwithstanding that pretended Restitution did conceive those Bishops incapable; and did request the judgment of *St. Cyprian* about it; which argueth the Pope's judgment not to have been peremptory and prevalent then in such cases. *St. Cyprian* denieth the Pope or any other person to have power of restoring in such a case; and exhorteth the Clergy to persist in declining the communion of those Bishops. Well doth *Rigaltius* ask, why they should write to *St. Cyprian* if the judgment of *Stephanus* was decisive; and he addeth that indeed, the Spaniards did appeal from the Roman Bishop to him of Carthage. No wonder, seeing the Pope had no greater authority, and probably *St. Cyprian* had the fairer reputation for wisdom and goodness. Considering which things, what can they gain by this Instance? which indeed doth considerably make against them.

2. They alledge the Restitution of *Athanasius*, and of others linked in cause with him, by Pope *Julius*. He, says *Sozomen*, as having the care of all by reason of the dignity of his See, restored to each his own Church.

I answer, the Pope did not restore them judicially, but declaratively; that is, declaring his approbation of their right and innocence, did admit them to communion. *Julius* in his own Defence did alledge, that *Athanasius* was not legally rejected; so that without any prejudice to the Canons he might receive him; and the doing it upon this account, plainly did not require any Act of Judgment.

Ὅτι ὁ πάντων κληρικῶν ἀπὸ περιστάσεως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἑπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποδιδόναι. Soz. 3. 8.

Ὁ δὲ ἡμετέρος αὐτὸς εἰς κοινότητα ἐπιστάτω. Soz. 3. 8.

Julii Epist. apud Ath. in Apol. 2.

without any prejudice to the Canons he might receive him; and the doing it upon this account, plainly did not require any Act of Judgment.

Nay

Nay it was necessary to avow those Bishops, as suffering in the cause of the common Faith. Besides, the Pope's proceeding was taxed, and protested against as irregular; nor did he Defend it by virtue of a general power that he had judicially to rescind the Acts of Synods. And lastly, the Restitution of *Athanasius* and the other Bishops, had no complete effect, till it was confirmed by the Synod of *Sardica*, backed by the Imperial authority; which in effect did restore them. This instance therefore is in many respects deficient as to their purpose.

3. They produce *Marcellus* being restored by the same Pope *Julius*. *Scor. 1. 36.*

But that instance, beside the forementioned defects, hath this, that the Pope was grievously mistaken in the case; whence *St. Basil* much *Bas. Ep. 10.* blameth him for his proceeding therein.

4. They cite the Restitution of *Eustathius* (Bishop of *Sebastia*) by Pope *Liberius* out of an Epistle of *St. Basil* where he says, *What the most blessed Bishop Liberius proposed to him, and to what he consented we know not; onely that he brought a Letter to be restored, and upon shewing to the Synod at Tyana was restored to his See.*

Τίνα μὲν εἶναι τὸν ἀποκαταστάσαντα αὐτὸν ὁ  
τῶν μετὰ τὸν τῶν ἑκείνου ἐπιστολῶν καὶ τῶν  
αὐτοῦ συνάξεων ἐκδομένων· καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ τῇ  
ἀλλοτρίᾳ ἐκδόσει ἀποκαταστάται αὐτὸν, καὶ  
ἀποκαταστάται τῇ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ συνάξεων  
τῶν τῶν τῶν — *Bas. Ep. 74.*

I answer, that Restitution was onely from an invalid Deposition *Soz. 4. 14.* by a Synod of *Arians* at *Melitine*; importing onely an acknowledgment of him, upon approbation of his Faith professed by him at *Rome*; the which had such influence to the satisfaction of the *Dioce-  
san* Synod at *Tyana*, that he was restored. Although indeed the *Romans* were abused by him, he not being sound in faith; for *He now* (saith *Saint Basil*) *doth destroy that faith for which he was received—*

Ὁ δὲ τὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ δόξαν  
*Basil. ibid.*

5. They adjoin, that *Theodoret* was restored by Pope *Leo I.* for in the Acts of the Synod of *Chalcedon* it is said, that *he did receive his place from the Bishop of Rome.*

Τὸν οἰκόμενον ἀπαλαῖον τόπον ὅθεν τῷ  
ἀριωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς μεταμελυνόμενης  
Ῥώμης — *Act. 1. p. 53.*

I answer, The act of *Leo* did consist in an approbation of the Faith, which *Theodoret* did profess to hold; and a reception of him to communion thereupon; which he might well doe, seeing the ground of *Theodoret's* being disclaimed was a misprision, that he (having opposed *Cyril's* Writings, judged Orthodox) did err in Faith, consenting with *Nestorius*.

Εἰς κοινὴν ἰδέαν — *Syn. Chalced. 8. p. 368.*

*Theodoret's* state before the Second *Ephesine* Synod, is thus represented in the words of the Emperour, *Theodoret Bishop of Cyrus, whom we have before commanded to mind onely his own Church, we charge not to come to the Holy Synod, before the whole Synod being met, it shall seem good to them that he come and bear his part in it.*

Θεοδώρητον μὲν τοῦ ἑπισκόπου τῆς  
Κύρου παλαιός, ὃν ἡμεῖς ἀναλάττομεν τῇ ἰδίᾳ  
αὐτοῦ μόνῃ ἑκκλησίᾳ ὁλοκλήρως, ἡμεῖς  
μὴ μὴ ὡς πρὶν εἰσελθεῖν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ σύ-  
νοδῳ, ἵνα μὴ πάσῃ ἀγίᾳ συνόδῳ συνελ-  
θούσῃ δεῖξῃ ὅτι αὐτὸν παραβιάζοντες, ὃ κοινὸν  
ἔστιν ἡμεῖς τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀγίας συνόδου.  
*Imp. Theod. Episc. ad Diof. in Syn. Chalced. Act. 1. p. 53.*

He was not Perfectly depofed; as other were who had others substituted in their places. He was depofed by the *Ephesine* Synod.

*Pro Theodoro autem Episcopo noster  
ordinatus est. Liberar. 12.*

*Id. Conc. Chalced. part. 2. p. 490. Ex-  
cludi verò ab Episcopatu, &c. in Impera-  
toris Theod. rescriptis.*

The Pope was indeed ready enough to assume the Patronage of so very learned and worthy a man, who in so very suppliant and respectful a way had redressed to him for succour; for whom doth not courtship mollifie? And the majority of the Synod, (being



inflamed against *Dioscorus* and the *Eutychian* Party) was ready enough to allow what the Pope did in favour of him. Yet a good part of the Synod (the Bishops of *Egypt*, of *Palestine* of *Illyricum* notwithstanding the Pope's Restitution (that is, his approbation in order thereto)

Ἐξέβησαν, ἐλεήσατε. ἡ πίστις ἀπώ-  
λутαι. εἰ γὰρ οὕτως τὴν ἐκβαλλομένην τὴν  
ἐξω βάλε, τὸ διδασκαλὸν Νεστορίου ἐξω  
βάλε. *Ibid.* p. 54.

did stickle against his admission into the Synod; crying out, *have pity on us, the faith is destroyed, the Canons proscribe this man, cast out, cast out Nestorius his Master.* So that the Imperial Agents were fain to compromise the business, permitting him to sit in the Synod, as one whose case was dependent, but not in the notion of one absolutely restored: *Theodore's presence shall prejudice no man, each one's right of impleading being reserved both to you and him.*

Πρόκειμα ὑπὸ τῷ πατρὶναι Θεοδώρῳ  
ἐδενέχθησαν, οὐλαππομένην διανοήσας  
ταῦτα παρὶς λόγῳ καὶ ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμῖν  
*Ibid.*

He therefore was not entirely restored, till upon a clear and satisfactory profession of his Faith he was acquitted by the judgment of the Synod. The effectual Restitution of him proceeded from the

Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα λέγουσαν ὁ διηγε-  
ταί βασιλεὺς — *Theod. Ep. 139.*  
(*ad Asperam.*)

Περὶ τῶν τούτων ὁ ἡμετέρος ἀδελφὸς  
τιμω ἱστέον — *Ep. 138. (ad Anatol.)*

Εἰσέτω καὶ ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Θεοδώρῳ  
κοινωνήσων τῇ συνόδῳ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀπα-  
ρατίσθησαν αὐτῷ τὸ ἑποκοπὴν ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος  
Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Λέων, καὶ ὁ ἁγιότατος βα-  
σιλεὺς — *Act. 1. p. 53.*

Emperour, who repealed the proceedings against him: as himself doth acknowledge; *All these things*, says he, *has the most just Emperour evanuated* — to these things he premised the redressing my injuries; and the Imperial Judges in the Synod of *Chalcedon* join the Emperour in the Restitution — *Let the most reverend Theodore enter and bear his part in the Synod, since the most holy Archbishop Leo, and sacred Emperour have restored his Bishoprick to him.* Hence it may appear

that the Pope's Restitution of *Theodore* was onely opinionative, dough-baked, incomplete; so that it is but a flimm advantage, which their pretence can receive from it.

IX. It belongeth to Sovereigns to receive Appeals from all lower Judicatures, for the final determination of Causes; so that no part of his Subjects can obstruct resort to him, or prohibit his revision of any Judgment.

This Power therefore the Pope doth most stiffly assert to himself. At the Synod of *Florence*, this was the first and great Branch of Au-

Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα πάντα τὰς ἑλλην-  
στίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ δέλεϊ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας —  
*Syn. Flor. Sess. 25. p. 846.*

thority, which he did demand of the Greeks explicitly to avow: — *he will* (said his three Cardinals to the Emperour) *have all the Privileges of his Church, and that Appeals be made to him.* When Pope *Alexander III.* was advised not to receive an Appeal in *Becket's Case*, he replied in that profane allusion, *This is my glory, which I will not give to another.* He hath been wont to encourage all People, even upon the slightest occasions, *iter arripere* (as the phrase is obvious in their Canon Law) to run with all haste to his audience;

*Hec est gloria mea, quam alteri non  
dabo.*

Concerning Appeals for the smallest causes we would have you hold, that the same deference is to be given them for how slight a matter soever they be made as if they were for a greater. See, if you please in *Gratian's Decree*, *Caus. 2. quæst. 6.* where many Papal Decrees (most indeed drawn out of the spurious *Epistles* of ancient Popes, but ratified by

*De appellationibus pro minimis causis  
volumus te tenere, quod eis pro quacunque  
levi causa fiant, non minus est, quam si pro  
majoribus ficerent, deferendum.* *Alex. III.  
Ep. ad Vigorn. Episc. in decret. Greg.  
lib. 2. tit. 28. cap. 11.*

*Caus. 2. qu. 6. Caus. 3. qu. 6. Caus. 9.  
qu. 3. c. p. 16.*

by their Successors, and obtaining for current Law) are made for Appeals to the See of Rome.

It was indeed one of the most ancient encroachments, and that which did serve most to introduce the rest; inferring hence a title to an universal Jurisdiction: *They are the Canons*, says Pope Nicholas I. *which will that all Appeals of the whole Church be brought to the examination of this See, and have decreed that no appeal be made from it, and that thus she judge of the whole Church, but her self goes to be judged by none other*; and the same Pope, in another of his Epistles, says, *The holy statutes and venerable decrees have committed the causes of Bishops, as being weighty matters, to be determined by us—As the Synod has appointed and usage requires, let greater and difficult cases be always referred to the Apostolick See*, says Pope Pelagius II. *They are the canons which will have the appeals of the whole Church tryed by this See*, saith Pope Gelasius I.

But this power is upon various accounts unreasonable, grievous and vexatious to the Church; as hath been deemed and upon divers occasions declared by the ancient Fathers, and grave persons in all times; upon accounts not only blaming the horrible abuse of Appeals, but implying the great mischiefs inseparably adherent to them.

The Synod of Basil thus excellently declared concerning them: *Hitherto many abuses of intolerable vexations have prevailed, whilst many have too often been called and cited from the most remote parts to the Court of Rome, and that sometimes for small and trifling matters, and with charges and trouble to be so wearied, that they sometime think it their best way to recede from their right, or buy off their trouble with great loss, rather than be at the cost of suing in so remote a Countrey.*

Saint Bernard complaineth of the mischiefs of Appeals in his times in these words, *How long will you be deaf to the complaints of the whole World, or make as if you were so? why sleep you? when will the consideration of so great confusion and abuse in appeals awake in you? they are made without right or equity, without due order and against custome. Neither place, nor manner, nor time, nor cause, nor person are considered: they are every where made lightly and for the most part unjustly: with much more passionate language to the same purpose.*

But in the Primitive Church the Pope had no such power.

1. Whereas in the first times many causes and differences did arise, wherein they who were condemned and worsted, would readily have resorted thither where they might have hoped for remedy, if Rome had been such a place of refuge, it would have been very famous for it; and we should find History full of examples; whereas it is very silent about them.

2. The most ancient Customs and Canons of the Church are flatly repugnant to such a power, for they did order causes finally to be decided in each Province.

*Ipsi sunt Canones, qui appellationes totius Ecclesie ad hujus Sedis examen voluerit deferri; ab ipsa vero nunquam prorsus appellari debere sanxerunt, ac per hoc illam de tota Ecclesia judicare ipsam nullius committere judicium. P. Nich. I. Epi. 8.*

*Sacra statuta, & veneranda decreta Episcoporum causas, utpote majora negotia nostra definiendas consue mandauerunt. P. Nich. I. Ep. 39.*

*Majores vero & difficiles questiones (ut sancta Synodus statuit, & beata consuetudo exigit) ad Sedem Apostolicam semper referantur. P. Pelag. II. Epist. 8.*

*Ipsi sunt canonibus qui appellationes totius Ecclesie ad hujus Sedis examen voluerit deferri. P. Gelas. I. Ep. 4.*

*Council. Basil. Sess. 31. (p. 86.)*

*Inoleverunt autem hactenus intolerabilium vexationum abusus permulti, dum nimium frequenter a remotissimis etiam partibus ad Romanam Curiam, & interdum pro parvis & minutis rebus ac negotiis quamplurimi citantur, & vocari consueverunt, atque ita expensis & laboribus fatigantur, ut nunquam commodius arbitrentur juri suo cedere, aut vexationem suam grave damnum redimere, quam in tam longinqua regione litium subire dispendia, &c. Vid. Opt.*

*Bern. de consid. lib. 3. cap. 2.*

*Quousque murmur universe terra aut dissimulas, aut non advertis? — &c.*

So the Synod of Nice did Decree; as the African Fathers did al-

*Decreta Nicena sive inferioris gradus Clericos sive Episcopos suis Metropolitanis aperitissime commiserunt. Syn. Afr. in Ep. ad P. Celest.*

*Arbitror te non ignorare quid præcipiant Niceni Concilii Canones, sancientes Episcopum non judicare causam citra terminus suos—nam—Pallad. cap. 7.*

ledge, in defence of their refusal to allow appeals to the Pope: *The Nicene decrees (said they) most evidently did commit both Clergymen of inferior degrees and Bishops to their Metropolitans.*

So Theoph.— in his *Epistle*, I suppose you are not ignorant what the Canons of the Nicene Council command, ordaining that a Bishop should judge no cause out of his own district.

3. Afterward when the *Diocesan* administration was introduced,

the last resort was decreed to the *Synods* of them (or to the *Primates* in them) all other appeals being prohibited; as dishonourable to the Bishops of the *Diocese*; reproaching the Canons, and subverting *Ecclesiastical Order*; To which Canon the Emperor *Justinian* referred; For it is decreed by our Ancestors that against the Sentence of these Prelates there should be no Appeal. So *Constantius* told Pope *Liberius*—that those things which had a form of judgement past on them could not be rescinded. This was the practice (at least in the Eastern parts of the Church) in the time of *Justinian*: as is evident by the *Constitutions* extant in the Code and in the *Novels*.

*Note*, That the Synod of *Constantinople* (Can. 6.) mentioning Appeals to the Emperor, secular Judicatories, a General Synod, saith,

*Ἀποκρίσεις τοῦ τῆ διοικήσεως Ἐπισκόπου, &c. Syn. Const. Can. 6.*

*Council. Constantinop. Can. 2, 6.*

*Council. Chalced. Can. 2, 17.*

*Nam contra horum Antistitem Sententias non esse locum Appelationi à majoribus nostris constitutum est. Cod. Lib. 1. tit. 4. cap. 29.*

*Τὰ πρὸς πῶτον ἁγνῶτα ἀναλυῖναι ἐν Νύκτι. Theod. 11. 16.*

*Nov. 123. cap. 22.*

*Cod. Lib. 1. tit. 4. Sect. 29. Vid. Græc.*

*Can. 12. Conc. Ant. Can. 15.*

*Cons. Carth. Can. 31.*

4. In derogation to this pretence divers *Provincial Synods* expressly did prohibit all Appeals from their decisions.

That of *Milevis*, -- Let them appeal only to African Councils or the

*Primates of Provinces; and he who shall think of appealing beyond Sea, let him be admitted into communion by none in Africk.*

*Non provocent nisi ad Africanam Concilia, him be admitted into communion by none in Africk. vel ad Primates Provinciarum; ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, à nullo infra Africanam in communionem suscipiatur. Conc. Milev. cap. 22. Conc. Afr. Can. 72.*

For if the Nicene Council took this care of the inferior Clergy, how much more did they intend it should relate to Bishops also?

*Nam si de inferioribus Clericis in Concilio Niceno hoc præceperunt; quanto magis de Episcopis voluit observari? Conc. Afr. Can. 105. (vel Epist.)*

5. All persons were forbidden to entertain communion with Bishops condemned by any one Church, which is inconsistent with their being allowed relief at *Rome*.

6. This is evident in the case of *Marcion*, by the assertion of the *Roman Church* at that time.

7. When the Pope hath offered to receive Appeals, or to meddle in cases before decided, he hath found opposition and reproof. Thus when *Felicissimus* and *Fortunatus*, having been censured and rejected from communion in *Africk*, did apply themselves to Pope *Cornelius*, with supplication to be admitted by him; Saint *Cyprian* maintaineth that fact to be irregular and unjust, and not to be countenanced, for divers reasons. Likewise, when *Basilides* and *Martialis*, being for their crimes deposed in *Spain*, had recourse to Pope *Stephans* for Restitution, the Clergy and People there had no regard to the judgment of the Pope; the which their resolution Saint *Cyprian* did commend and encourage.

*Cypr. Ep. 55. (ad Cornelium.)*

*Cypr. Ep. 68.*

When



When *Athanasius*, *Marcellus*, *Paulus*, &c. having been condemned by *Synods*, did apply themselves for relief to Pope *Julius*; the *Oriental Bishops* did highly tax this course as irregular; disclaiming any power in him to receive them, or meddle in their cause. Nor could Pope *Julius* by any Law or Instance disprove their plea; Nor did the Pope assert to himself any peculiar authority to revise the Cause, or otherwise justify his proceeding than by right common to all Bishops of vindicating Right and Innocence, which were oppressed; and of asserting the Faith, for which they were persecuted. Indeed at first the *Oriental Bishops* were contented to refer the cause to Pope *Julius* as Arbitratour; which signifieth that he had no ordinary right; but afterward, either fearing their Cause or his Prejudice, they started, and stood to the canonicalness of the former decision.

The contest of the *African Church* with Pope *Celestine*, in the Cause of *Apianus* is famous; and the Reasons which they assign for repelling that Appeal, are very notable peremptory.

8. Divers of the Fathers alledge like reasons Appeals. Saint *Cyprian* alledgeith these: Refer. ad Sect. 7. Vid. Supr. Oportet utique

*eos quibus præsunt non circumferre, nec Episcoporum concordiam coherentem suam subdola & fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illis causam suam, ubi & accusatores habere, & testes sui criminis possint.* Cyp. Ep. 55.

1. Because there was an Ecclesiastical Law against them.
2. Because they contain iniquity; as prejudicing the right of each Bishop granted by Christ, in governing his flock.
3. Because the Clergy and People should not be engaged to run gadding about.
4. Because Causes might better be decided there, where witnesses of fact might easily be had.
5. Because there is every where a competent authority, equal to any that might be had elsewhere.
6. Because it did derogate from the gravity of Bishops to alter their Censure---

7. Pope *Liberius* desired of *Constantius* that the Judgment of *Athanasius* might be made in *Alexandria* for such reasons, because there the accused, the accusers, and their defender were.

— *Ἐνθα ὁ ἐγκλησθεὶς, καὶ οἱ ἐγκλησθέντες ἐστὶν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολογούμενος αὐτοῦ.* — Theod. 11. 16.

8. St. *Chrysostome's* Argument against *Theophilus* meddling in his case may be set against *Rome* as well as *Alexandria*.

9. St. *Austin* in matter of appeal, or rather of reference to candid Arbitration (more proper for Ecclesiastical causes) doth conjoin other Apostolical Churches with that of *Rome*; For the business, says he, was not about Priests and Deacons or the inferiour Clergy, but the Collegues [Bishops,] who may reserve their cause entire for the judgment of their Collegues, especially those of the Apostolical Churches. He would not have said so, if he had apprehended that the Pope had a peculiar right of revising Judgments.

*Neque enim de Presbyteris aut Diaconis, aut inferioris ordinis Clericis, sed de Collegis agebatur qui possunt aliorum Collegarum iudicio, praesertim Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum, causam suam integram reservare.* Aug. Ep. 162.

10. Pope *Damasus* (or rather Pope *Siricius*) doth affirm himself incompetent to judge in a case, which had been afore determined by the Synod of *Capua*; —but, says he, since the Synod of *Capua* has thus determined it, we perceive we cannot judge it.

*Sed cum huiusmodi fuerit Concilii Caputensis iudicium — advertimus quod & nobis iudicandi forma competere non possit.*

11. Anciently there were no Appeals (properly so called or jurisdictional) in the Church; they were, as *Socrates* telleth us, introduced

Τὸ πρῶτον ἐν  
μὴν ὧν ὁ  
πᾶσι τοῖς  
ἐκκλησιαστικῶν  
καὶ κατὰ τὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν ἐπι-  
στὴν ἀλλήλους ὡς ἐν  
δικαιοσύνην δι-  
καστέον. Ibid.

ced by Cyril of Hierusalem; who first did appeal to a greater Judicature, against Ecclesiastical rule and custome. This is an Argument, that about that time (a little before the great Synod of Constantinople) greater Judicatories, or Diocesan Synods were established; whenas before Provincial Synods were the last resorts.

Being depofed he sent a libel of Appeal to them who depofed him, appealing to a greater Judicature.

12. Upon many occasions Appeals were not made to the Pope as in all likelihood they would have been, if it had been supposed that a power of receiving them did belong to him. Paulus Samosatenus did appeal to the Emperour. The Donatists did not appeal to the Pope, but to the Emperour. Their Cause was by the Emperour referred not to the Pope singly (as it ought to have been, and would have been by so just a Prince if it had been his right) but to him and other judges as the Emperour's Commissioners. Athanasius did first appeal to the Emperour. St Chrysostome did request the Pope's Succour, but he did not appeal to him as judge; altho' he knew him favourably disposed, and the Cause sure in his hand; but he appealed to a General Council; the which Innocent himself did conceive necessary for decision of that Cause.

Illi vero ab Ecclesiastico judicio provo-  
casse, &c. Aug. Ep.  
Ad Imperatorem appellaverunt. Aug.  
de Unit. Eccl. cap. 16.

Quid quod nec ipse Usurpavit; rogatus  
Imperator iudicem misit: Episcopus qui cum  
ipso sederent, & de tota illa causa quod iust-  
um videretur statuerunt. Aug. Ep. 162.

\*Αναγκάζει ἔτι διὰ τῶν συνόδων.  
Sozom. 8. 26.

[ There are in History innumerable Instances of Bishops being condemned and expelled from their Sees, but few of appeals; which is a sign that was no approved remedy in common opinion. ]

Infra.  
Infra.

Eutyches did appeal to all the Patriarchs. Theodoret did intend to appeal to all the Western Bishops.

13. Those very Canons of Sardica (the most unhappy that ever were made to the Church) which did introduce appeals to the Pope, do yet upon divers accounts prejudice his claim to an original right, and do upon no account favour that use of them, to which (to the overthrow of all Ecclesiastical liberty and good discipline) they have been perverted. For,

1. They do pretend to confer a Privilege on the Pope; which argueth that he before had no claim thereto.

2. They do qualifie and restrain that Privilege to certain Cases and Forms; which is a sign, that he had no power therein flowing from absolute Sovereignty; for it is strange, that they who did Pretend and intend so much to favour him should clip his power.

3. It is not really a power which they grant of receiving Appeals in all causes; but a power of constituting Judges, qualified according to certain conditions, to revise a special sort of causes concerning the Judgment and Deposition of Bishops. Which considerations do subvert his pretence to original and universal Jurisdiction upon Appeals.

14. Some Popes did challenge Jurisdiction upon Appeals, as given them by the Nicene Canons, meaning thereby those of Sardica; which sheweth they had no better plea, and therefore no original right. And otherwere we shall consider, what validity those Canons may be allowed to have.

15. The General Synod of Chalcedon (of higher authority than that of Sardica) derived Appeals, at least in the Eastern Churches, into another chanel; namely to the Primate of each Diocese, or to the Patri-  
arch

arch of Constantinople. That this was the last resort doth appear, *Con. 9, 17.* from that otherwise they would have mentioned the Pope.

16. Appeals in cases of Faith, or general Discipline were indeed sometimes made to the consideration of the Pope; but not onely to him, but to all other Patriarchs and Primates, as concerned in the common maintenance of the common Faith, or Discipline. So did Eutyches appeal to the Patriarchs.

17. The Pope even in later times, even in the Western parts hath found rubs in his Trade of Appeals. Consider the scuffle between Pope Nicholas I. and Hincmarus Bishop of Rhemes.

18. Christian States, to prevent the intolerable vexations and mischiefs arising from this practice, have been constrained to make Laws against them. Particularly England.

In the Twelfth Age Pope Paschal II. complained of King Henry I. That he deprived the oppressed of the benefit of appealing to the Apostolick See. It was one of King Henry I. Laws, --- none is permitted to cry from thence, no judgment is thence brought to the Apostolick See. Foreign judgments we utterly remove, --- there let the cause be tried where the crime was committed. It was one of the Grievances sent to Pope Innocent IV. That Englishmen were drawn out of the Kingdom by the Pope's Authority, to have their causes heard.

Nor in after-times were Appeals by Law in any case permitted without the King's leave; although sometimes by the facility of Princes, or difficulty of times, the Roman Court (ever importunate and vigilant for its profits) did obtain a relaxation or neglect of Laws inhibiting Appeals.

19. There were Appeals from Popes to General Councils very frequently. *Vid.* The Senate of Paris after the Concordats between Lewis XI. and Pope Leo X.

20. By many Laws and instances it appeareth, that Appellations have been made to the Emperours in the greatest Causes; and that without Popes reclaiming or taking it in bad part.

St. Paul did \* appeal to Cesar. Paulus Samosatensis did appeal to Aurelianus. So the Donatists did appeal to Constantine. † Athanasius to Constantine. The Egyptian Bishops to Constantine. \* Priscillianus to Maximus. Idacius to Gracian. So that Canons were made to restrain Bishops from recourse ad Comitatum.

21. Whereas they do alledge Instances for Appeal, those well considered do prejudice their Cause; for they are few, in comparison to the occasions of them, that ever did arise; they are near all of them late, when Papal encroachments had grown; some of them are very impertinent to the cause; some of them may strongly be retorted against them; all of them are invalid.

If the Pope originally had such a right (known, unquestionable, prevalent) there might have been producible many, ancient, clear, proper, concluding Instances.

All that Bellarmine (after his own search, and that of his Predecessors in Controversie) could muster, are these following; upon which we shall briefly reflect: (adding a few others, which may be alledged by them.)

Baron.  
Anno 865 —  
P. Nic. I.  
Ep. 37, &c.  
Vid. Matt. Paris, Ann. 1094.  
Statutes of  
Previsors, Pre-  
munire, &c.

Vos oppressis Apostolica Sedis appellationem subtrahitis. Eadm. p. 113.

Nullus inde clamor, nullum inde judicium ad Sedem Apostolicam destinatur. Eadm. p. 113.

Peregrina judicia modis omnibus submoventur. Hen. I. Leg. cap. 31.

Ibi semper causa agitur, ubi crimen admittitur. Ibid.

Quid Angli extra regnum in causis auctoritate Apostolica trahuntur. Matt. Paris, p. 699. 10.

Πάσα ἰσχυρὰ  
Rom. 13. 1.

\* Act. 25.

Ad Imperatorem appellaverunt. Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 16.

† Apol. 2. p. 804.

|| Ath. Apol. 2. p. 797, 798.

\* Ad Principem provocavit. Sulp. Sev. 2. 64. Sulp. Sev. 2. 63. Conc. Ant. Can.

P. de Marca. 4. 4. —



Ann. 142.

He alledgeth *Marcion*, as appealing to the Pope.Epiph. *her.* 41.

Ἐξῆς πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν.  
Ἀποδιδέσκει καὶ ἀντιστ. εἰς τὸν Πά-  
ππν.

Οὐ δύναμεθα ἀντὶ τῆς ἐπιτομῆς τῆς τιμῆς  
Πατρὸς; οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο ποιεῖται. ὡς γὰρ ἐστὶν πῶς,  
καὶ ὡς οὐκ ὁμοῖον, καὶ ὡς δύναμεθα ἐκκλησιάζε-  
ται πρὸς καλὴν συνήθειαν ἢ Πάππν τῶ σφ.

The truth was, that *Marcion* for having corrup-  
ted a Maid was by his own Father, Bishop of *Si-  
nope*, driven from the Church; whereupon he did  
thence fly to Rome, there begging admittance to  
communion, but none did grant it; at which he  
expostulating, they replied, *We cannot without the  
permission of thy honourable Father doe this*; for there  
is one faith, and one concord; and we cannot cross  
thy Father our good fellow-Minister: This was the

case and issue; and is it not strange this should be produced for an  
Appeal, which was only a supplication of a fugitive criminal to be  
admitted to communion; and wherein is utterly disclaimed any  
power to thwart the Judgment of a particular Bishop or Judge, up-  
on account of unity in common faith and peace? should the Pope  
return the same answer to every Appellant, what would become of  
his Privilege? So that they must give us leave to retort this as a  
pregnant Instance against their pretence.

Cypr. Ep. 55.

Ann. 252.

He alledgeth the forementioned address of *Felicissimus* and *Fortu-  
natus* to Pope *Cornelius*; the which was but a factious *circumcursion*  
of desperate wretches; the which, or any like it, St. *Cyprian* argueth  
the Pope in law and equity obliged not to regard; because a definiti-  
ve Sentence was already passed on them by their proper Judges in  
*Africk*, from whom in conscience and reason there could be no Appeal.  
So *Bellarmino* would filch from us one of our invincible Arguments  
against him.

Cypr. Ep. 68.

He also alledgeth the case of *Baslides*; which also we before did  
shew to make against him; his application to the Pope being disa-  
vowed by St. *Cyprian*, and proving ineffectual.

These are all the Instances which the first three hundred years did  
afford; so that all that time this great Privilege lay dormant.

Ann. 350.

He alledgeth the recourse of *Athanasius* to Pope *Julius*; but this was  
not properly to him as to a Judge, but as to a fellow-Bishop, a friend of  
truth and right, for his succour and countenance  
against persecutors of him, chiefly for his Or-  
thodoxy. The Pope did undertake to examine  
his Plea, partly as Arbitratour upon reference of

Διδασκόντες ἐπὶ καταλύσει τῆς πίστεως  
τὰς καθ' ἡμέρας ἡρώδης. Socr. 2. 20.

both Parties; partly for his own concern to satisfy himself whether  
he might admit him to communion. And having heard and weighed  
things, the Pope denied that he was condemned in a legal way by  
competent Judges; and that therefore the pretended Sentence was null;  
and consequently he did not undertake the cause as upon Appeal.  
But whereas his proceeding did look like an exercise of Jurisdiction,  
derogatory to a Synodical resolution of the case, he was opposed by  
the *Oriental* Bishops, as usurping an undue power. Unto which  
charge he doth not answer directly by asserting to himself any such  
authority by Law or Custom; but otherwise excusing himself. In  
the issue, the Pope's Sentence was not peremptory; untill upon ex-  
amining the merits of the cause it was approved for just as to mat-  
ter by the Synod of *Sardica*. These things o-  
therwhere we have largely shewed; and conse-  
quently this Instance is deficient.

Socr. 2. 20.

Ὁς (Athanasius & Paulus) τὰ καὶ  
ἐν τῇ καὶ τῇ πίστεως ἐπὶ Οἰκουμενικῇ  
συνόδῳ τὴν ἐν Λαβείν, Socr. 2. 20.

He

He alledgeth St. *Chrysostome*, as appealing to Pope *Innocent* I. but if you read his *Epistles* to that Pope, you will find no such matter; he doth onely complain, and declare to him the iniquity of the process against him, not as to a Judge, but as to a friend and fellow-Bishop concerned, that such injurious and mischievous dealings should be stopped; requesting from him not judgment of his cause, but succour in procuring it by a General Synod; to which indeed he did appeal, as *Sozomen* expressly telleth us; and as indeed he doth himself affirm. Accordingly Pope *Innocent* did not assume to himself the judgment of his cause, but did endeavour to procure a Synod for it, affirming it to be needfull; why so, if his own Judgment, according to his Privilege did suffice? why indeed did not Pope *Innocent*, (being well satisfied in the case, yea passionately touched with it) presently summon *Theophilus* and his adherents, undertaking the Trial? did Pope *Nicholas* I. proceed so in the case of *Rhotaldus*? why was he content onely to write *Consolatory Letters* to him, and to his people; not pretending to undertake the decision of his cause? if the Pope had been endowed with such a Privilege, it is morally impossible that it should not have shone forth clearly upon this occasion; it could hardly be that St. *Chrysostome* himself should not in plain terms avow it; that he should not formally apply to it as the most certain and easie way of finding relief? that he should not earnestly mind and urge the Pope to use his Privilege: why should he speak of that tedious and difficult way of a General Synod, when so short and easie a way was at hand? but the truth is, he did not know any such power the Pope had by himself. St. *Chrysostome* rather did conceive all such foreign Judicatures to be unreasonable and unjust; for the Argument which he darteth at *Theophilus* doth as well reach the Papal Jurisdiction upon appeals; for *It was* (saith he) *not congruous, that an Egyptian should judge those in Thrace*; why not an Egyptian as well as an Italian? and *If* (saith he) *this custome should prevail, and it become lawfull for those who will to go into the Parishes of others, even from such distances, and to cast out whom any one pleaseth, doing by their own authority what they please, know that all things will go to wreck*—Why may not this be said of a Roman as well as of an Alexandrian? St. *Chrysostome* also (we may observe) did not onely apply himself to the Pope, but to other Western Bishops; particularly to the Bishops of *Milain* and *Aquileia*; whom he called *Beatissimi Domini*: did appeal to them?

He alledgeth *Flavianus* Bishop of *Constantinople* appealing to Pope *Leo*: but let us consider the story. *Flavianus* for his Orthodoxy (or upon other accounts) very injuriously treated and oppressed by *Dioscorus*, who was supported by the favour of the Imperial Court; having in his case no other remedy did appeal to the Pope; who alone among

Tom. 7. Epist. 122; 123.

Πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητα ἀγγέλλω.

Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμῶν ἀρίστην δια-  
ραγήναι, καὶ συναλγεῖσθαι. καὶ πάντα ποιῆ-  
σαι, ὥστε εἶναι τὰ τὰ καλὰ.

Οἰκουμενικῶς ἀπεκρίθη τὸ σῶσιμον.  
Soz. 8. 17.

Ἄλλ' ἀπόντων ἡμῶν καὶ σῶσιμον ἐπι-  
λαμβάνον. Theod. 5. 34.

Οἰκουμενικὴν δὲ σῶσιν συναλγεῖται ἀπο-  
δέξων. Soz. 8. 26.

Αναγκαῖα δὲ διὰ γνώσεως σῶσιμον.  
Ibid.

Ἰννοκέντιος δὲ ὁ Ρώμης, καὶ Φαβιανὸς  
Ἀντιοχείας καὶ ἐκαιροῦντο τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ  
Ἰωάννη, ὅλα διὰ γεγραμμάτων ἡ πικρὰ  
καὶ ἄλλων περιεμύθησαν, καὶ ἐδολοχέοντο  
τοῖς τοιμήμασι. Theoph. Soz. 8. 26.

Οὐ γὰρ ἀκόλουθον ἦν τῷ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τοῖς  
ἐν Θρᾷ διαλέξαι.

Εἰ γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον τὸ ἔθος καὶ ἐξ  
ἡμετέρας τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ἀπο-  
στασιάζοντες καὶ ἐκ τούτων διασπασθέντες,  
καὶ ἐμβαλλόντες ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ κατ' ἐξου-  
σίαν ἰδίαν περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνιδόλων,  
ὥστε πάντα οὐκ εἰστί. — Epist. 122.

Scriptimus ista & ad Venerium Medice-  
lancensem, & ad Chromatium Aquilegi-  
ensem Episcopum. Pallad. cap. 2.

whom he called Bea-

Flavianus autem contra se prolatus sen-  
tentia per ejus legatos Sedem Apostolicam  
appellavit libello Liber. cap. 12.

Necessitate coactus fuit ita agere, ut  
quid reliqui Patriarcha adissent. —  
Marc. 7. 7.

the *Patriarchs* had dissented from those Proceedings. The Pope was himself involved in the cause, being of the same persuasion; having been no less affronted and hardly treated (considering their power, and that he was out of their reach) and condemned by the same Adversaries.

To him therefore as to the leading Bishop of *Christendom*, in the first place interested in defence of the common Faith, together with a Synod,

ὡς ἀποκαταστήσειν — Placidia.  
Πρὸς τοὺς Ἀποστολικὰς Δείνον καὶ πᾶσι  
πᾶσι τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις καὶ μερὶν τούτων. Syn.  
Chalc. Act. 1. p. 26.

not to him as sole Judge, did *Flavianus* appeal. He (saith *Placidia* in her Letter to *Theodosius*) did appeal to the Apostolick See, and to all the Bishops of these parts; that is to the rest of *Christendom*,

which were not engaged in the Party of *Dioscorus*; and to whom else could he have appealed?

Κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ  
ἐπὶ συνόδῳ.  
p. 25.

*Valentinian* in his *Epistle* to *Theodosius* in behalf of Pope *Leo* saith, that he did appeal according to the manner of Synods; and whatever those words signifie, that could not be to the Pope as a single Judge; for before that time in whatever Synod was such an appeal made? what custome could there be favourable to such a pretence?

But what his Appeal did import is best interpretable by the proceeding consequent; which was not the Pope's assuming to himself the Judicature either immediately or by delegation of Judges, but endeavouring to procure a General Synod for it; the which endeavour doth appear in many *Epistles* to *Theodosius* and to his Sister *Pulcheria*, solici-

Omnes mansuetudini vestra cum gemitibus & lachrymis supplicans Sacerdotes, ut quia & nostri fideliter reclamant, & ejusdem libellum appellationis Flavianus Episcopus dedit, generalis Synodum jubetis intra Italiam celebrari. — P. Leo Epist. 25.

ting that such a Synod might be indicted by his order: All the Bishops (saith Pope *Leo*) with sighs and tears do supplicate your Grace, that because our Agents did faithfully reclaim, and Bishop *Flavianus* did present them a libel of appeal, you would command a General Synod to be celebrated in Italy.

*Dioscorus* and his Party would scarce have been so silly as to condemn *Flavianus*, if they had known, (which, if it had been a case clear in law or obvious in practice, they could not but have known) that the Pope, who was deeply engaged in the same cause, had a power to reverse (and revenge) there proceedings. Nor would the good Emperour *Theodosius* so pertinaciously have maintained the proceedings of that *Ephesine* Synod, if he had deemed the Pope duly Sovereign Governour and Judge; or that a right of ultimate Decision upon Appeal did appertain to him. Nor had the Pope needed to have taken so much pains in procuring a Synod, if he could have judged without it. Nor would Pope *Leo* (a man of so much spirit and zeal for the dignity of his See) have been so wanting to the maintenance of his right, as not immediately to have proceeded unto Trial of the Cause, without precarious attendance for a Synod, if he thought his pretence to such Appeals as we now speak of, to have been good or plausible in the world at that time.

The next case is that of *Theodoret*. His words indeed, framed according to his condition, needing the patronage of Pope *Leo*, being then high in reputation, do sound favourably; but we abstracting

Ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς Ἀποστολικὴν ὑμῶν Δείνον σεβόμενος καὶ ὑποτάσσων καὶ ἀντιπροσώπων ὑμῶν ἐκτελέων καὶ ἐκτελέων καὶ ἐκτελέων. Ep. 113. (ad P. Leonem.)

from the sound of words must regard the reason of things, His words are these, I expect the suffrage of your Apostolick See, and beseech and earnestly entreat your holiness to succour me who appeal to your right and just Judicature.

Theod.

He never had been particularly or personally judged, and therefore did not need to appeal as to a Judge; nor therefore is his application



plication to the Pope to be interpreted for such; but rather as to a charitable succourer of him in his distress, by his countenance and endeavour to relieve him.

Vid. Ep. 113.  
ad Domnum.  
Ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ

ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἔχοντες ἑαυτὸν ἐκτείναντες, ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς διανοήσασθαι, ὥστε παρὸντα καὶ νῦν — καὶ τοῦτο εἶπε  
ἰδού τις καὶ πῶς μὴ διατασσέτω κατεκείδω.  
Οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ δικασαὶ τὸ πᾶν κατεκείδω, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ λίαν ἐπυνήσαντες τὰ δὴ εἶναι εἰς  
κατηρεῖαν ἡμῶν ἐπιδιδόντα συγγραμμάτια. Epist. 138.

He onely was supposed erroneous in Faith, and a perillous abettour of Nestorianism, because he had smartly contradicted Cyril; which prejudice did cause him to be prohibited from coming to the Synod of Ephesus; and there in his absence to be denounced Heterodox.

Βασιλικὸς γὰρ  
ἡμεῖς τῇ Κ. Ἐκ.  
ἐκφ. πρὸς δὲ  
πᾶσι γενο-  
μασιν —  
Epist. 145.  
Vid. Theod.

Epist. Supr. & Ep. 127, 129. καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐνδεῖν καθεύδει βασιλικὸς. Βασιλικὸς γεγραμμένον καὶ ἐκείνῃ  
καταλαβὼν τὸ ἔκδοτον — Ep. 138, 136.

Μαθεὶν ἀποβολῇ παρ' ἡμῶν εἴτε καὶ μετὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τῶν Καθάρων, ἢ μὴ. Ep. 113.  
Ὅτε καὶ τὰς τῆς ἀναστάσεως Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀπαραύτου κηδεμονίας. Ep. 118.

His Appeal then to the Pope (having no other recourse in whom he did confide, finding him to concur with himself in opinion against *Eutychianism*) was no other than (as the word is often used in common speech, when we say, I appeal to your judgment in this or that case) a referring it to the Pope's consideration, whether his Faith was sound and Orthodox; capacitating him to retain his Office: the which upon his explication and profession thereof (presented in terms of extraordinary respect and deference) the Pope did approve; thereby as a good Divine rather than as a formal Judge) acquitting him of Heterodoxy: the which approbation (in regard to the great opinion they had of the Pope's skill in those points, and to the favour he had obtained by contesting against the *Eutychians*) did bear great sway in the Synod; so that, (although not without opposition of many, and not upon absolute terms) he was permitted to sit among the Fathers of Chalcedon.

Τὰ δὲ παρ' ἡμῶν κατεκείδω καὶ ἐκείνῃ  
ἰσχύει ἀντὶ.

#### Observations.

1. We do not read of any formal Trial the Pope made of Theodoret's case; that he was cited, that his Accusers did appear, that his Cause was discussed: but onely a simple approbation of him.

2. We may observe that Theodoret did write to Flavianus in like terms: We entreat your holiness to fight in behalf of the faith which is assaulted, and to defend the Canons which are trampled under foot.

Τὴν σὺν ἀγαπῶντι Θεοφίλῳ πρὸς  
ἐμὴν πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Theod.  
Epist. 86.

3. We may observe, that Theodoret expecting this favour of Pope Leo; and thence being moved to commend the Roman See to the height, and to reckon its special advantages, doth not yet mention his Supremacy of power, or Universality of Jurisdiction: For those words, *it becometh you to be prime in all things*, are onely general words relating to the advantages which he subjoineth; of which he saith, *for your throne is adorned with many advantages*, in a florid enumeration whereof he passeth over that of peculiar Jurisdiction; he nameth the magnitude, splendour, majesty and populousness of the City; the early faith praised by St. Paul, the Sepulchres of the two great Apostles, and their decease their;

Διὰ πᾶντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐκείνῃ ἀγαπῶντι  
Πολλοὶς γὰρ ὑμῶν τῶν Θεῶν κοσμοῦ  
καὶ ἐκκλησίας.  
ἔχει γὰρ ὁ πατριάρχης τῆς ἁγίας  
ἐκκλησίας, καὶ πολλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνάγκην  
ἀποστολῆς ἐκείνῃ ἀγαπῶντι ἀποστολῆς  
ἀποστολῆς, καὶ ὅτις πάντας ὅσους εἰς  
ἐκείνῃ ἀγαπῶντι ἀποστολῆς ἀποστολῆς  
εἰν' ἀπὸ τῶν διετέλεσται. Theod. Ep. 116.  
(ad Renatum. Præb.)

but

That holy See but the Pope's being Universal Sovereign and Judge (which was the main advantage whereof that See could be capable) he doth not mention; why? because he was not aware thereof, else surely he would not have passed it in silence.

any reasons; but especially because she continued free from the taint of heresie, and none otherwise minded ever sat in her, she having kept the Apostolick state always unmixt.

4. We may also observe, that whatever the opinion of *Theodoret* was now concerning the Pope's power, he not long before did hardly take him for such a Judge, when he did oppose Pope *Celestine*, concurring with *Cyril*, at the first *Epheſine* Synod. He then indeed looking on Pope *Celestine* as a prejudiced Adversary, did not write to him but

Kal tois Dioskourais h' h' Nicos 'E-  
piskopais; tis Misdokans omi, h' tis  
'Akhleias h' tis 'Rabenns dei taton  
isegaleion, diadipnemasoi ws t' 'Ap-  
loneis tauta xanokias pitheront.  
Theod. Epist. 112.

to the other Bishops of the *West*, as we see by those words in his Epistle to *Domnus*; And we have written to the Bishops of the *West* about these things, to him of *Milain*, I say, to him of *Aquilcia* and him of *Ravenna*, testifying, &c.

5. Yea we may observe, that *Theodoret* did intend with the Empe-  
rour's leave to appeal or refer his cause to the whole body of *Western*

Ανθολογ τῶν ὑμῶν μετὰ τοῦ  
πᾶν τῶν αὐτῶν ἡ δὲ τῶν καλ-  
λινικῶν κορυφῶν, ὅτε μὴ ἡ ἐσπερὶν ἔσπε-  
ρασθῇ, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἐν ἐκείνῃ διορι-  
στικῶν ἡ ἀνωτάτων Ἐπισκόπων διὰ τῶν  
δυν. Theod. Ep. 119. (ad Anatol.)

Bishops, as himself doth express in those words to *Anatolius*, I do pray your magnificence, that you would request this favour of our dread Sovereign, that I may have recourse to the *West*, and may be judged by the most religious and holy Bishops there.

*Bellarmino* farther doth alledge the appeal of *Hadrianus* Bishop of *Thebes* to Pope *Gregory I.* the which he received and asserted by ex-communicating the Archbishop of *Justiniana Prima*, for deposing *Hadrianus* without regard to that appeal. I answer,

Greg. lib. 2.  
Indict. 11.  
Ep. 6.

1. The example is late, when the Popes had extended their power beyond the ancient and due limits: those *Maxims* had got in before the time of that worthy Pope; who thought he might use the power of which he found himself possessed.

2. It is impertinent, because the Bishop of *Justiniana* had then a special dependence upon the *Roman* See; from whence an Universal Jurisdiction upon appeal cannot be inferred.

3. It might be an Usurpation; nor doth the opinion or practice of Pope *Gregory* suffice to determine a question of right, for good men are liable to prejudice, and its consequences.

To these Instances produced by *Bellarmino*, some add the Appeal of *Eutyches* to Pope *Leo*; to which it may be excepted, that if he did appeal, it was not to the Pope solely, but to him with the other

\*Αναγιγνωσκόντες ἡ ἐκδορίσας, ἐπι-  
ναλίσκῳ τῶν ἀγίων συνόδων τῶν ἀνωτάτων  
Ἐπισκόπων 'Ρώμης, ἡ 'Αλεξανδρείας, ἡ  
'Ιεροσολύμων, ἡ 'Θεσσαλονίκης. Syn. Chal-  
ced. 1.

*Patriarchs*; so it is expressly said in the *A&S* of the *Chalcedon* Synod; His deposition being read, he did appeal to the Holy Synod of the most Holy Bishop of *Rome*, and of *Alexandria*, and of *Jerusalem*, and of *Theſſalonica*; the which is an argu-

ment, that he did not apprehend the right of receiving Appeals did solely or peculiarly belong to him of *Rome*.

Ingressus est ad Calcedonem Antioche-  
norum Patriarcham, & sumptis ab eo inter-  
cessionis Synodicalis Literis Romanum Pontifi-  
cem Simplicium appellavit, sicut B. fecerat  
Athanasius, & suavit scribere pro se Acacio  
Constantinopolitano Episcopo. Liber.  
cap. 18. Baron. Anno 483. Sect. 1.

*Liberatus* saith, that *Johannes Talaida* went to *Calcedon* Patriarch of *Antioch*, and taking of him intercessory Synodical Letters, appeal'd to *Simplicius* Bishop of *Rome*, as *Saint Athanasius* had done, and persuaded him to write in his behalf to *Acacius* Bishop of *Constantinople*.

1. It is no wonder, that any Bishop being condemned, especially in causes relating to Faith or common Interest, should have recourse to the *Roman* Bishop, or to any other Bishop of great authority for refuge or for relief; which they may hope to be procured by them by the influence of their reputation, and their power among their dependents.

3. Good men being abused will express some resentment, and complain of their wrongs, where they may presume of a fair and favourable hearing: so did *Athanasius*, *Flavianus*, *St. Chrysostome*, *Theodore* apply themselves to the same Bishops, flourishing in so great reputation and wealth.

They jointly did endeavour, that the trains against them might be examined by the Emperour as Judge, and by the Bishop John; for they conceived that he having conscience of using a just freedom, would be able to succour them according to right: but he did receive the men applying to them courteously, and treated them respectfully, and did not hinder them from praying in the Church—He also writ to Theophilus to render communion to them; as being Orthodox; and if there were need of judging their case by law, that he would send whom they thought good to prosecute the cause.

4. And when men, either good or bad, do resort in this manner to great friends, it is no wonder if they accost them in highest terms of respect, and with exaggerations of their eminent advantages; so inducing them to regard and favour their cause.

6. And when any person doth continue long in a flourishing estate, so that such addressees are frequently made to him, no wonder that an opinion of lawfull power to receive them, doth arise both in him and

Κοιτῶν τὰ ἐσπέρουζον ὡς βασιλεὺς καί-  
τῃ καὶ Ἰακωβὸν τὸν Ἐπισκοπὸν ἐλίσσας  
τὰς γὰρ αὐτῶν σφραγίδας ὥστε γὰρ ἐπὶ  
καὶ παρρησίας αὐτοῦ ὁποῦμαιμενον διναί-  
τὰ δικαία βουθεῖν αὐτοῖς ὃ ὡς παλα-  
δοῖας αὐτῶν τοῦ σφραγίσαι εὐχερὲς ὡς ἐδί-  
δατο, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ. καὶ εὐχρηστῶς ὅτι Ἐκ-  
κλησιαστικὰς καὶ ἀδυναστίας ἐξαρτῶν ἡ  
φίλῳ κοινοῖται αὐτοῖς ἀποδύνα, ὅς ἐρ-  
δοῖς σφλ. ὅ. ὁ δὲ δὲ ἐκκλ. καὶ ἐν τῇ δικαί  
καὶ ἐκκλ. τὰ κατὰ αὐτὴν, ἀποδύναμεν ὅ  
αὐτὴ δικαί δικαί σφραγίσμενον. Sot. 8. 13.

Φιλῆ μάλιστα χρίματιζαν τὸ ἀνέχον  
 ἄνθρωπος τὸ ἀντιπρὸς, καὶ οἱ ὀνόματις ἐκείνης  
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐκείνης. Greg. Naz.  
 Orat. 23.



in others; so that of a voluntary Friend he become an authorized Protectour, a Patron, a Judge of such persons in such cases.

X. The Sovereign is fountain of all Jurisdiction; and all inferiour Magistrates derive their Authority from his warrant and Commission, acting as his Deputies or Ministers, according to that intimation in  
1 Pet. 2. 13. St. Peter, --whether to the King as Supreme, or to Governours as sent by him.

Accordingly the Pope doth challenge this advantage to himself that he is the fountain of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; pretending all Episcopal power to be derived from him.

*Regimen Ecclesie est, Monarchicum, ergo omnis auctoritas est in uno, & ab illa in alios derivatur. Bell. 4. 24. Epiph. her. 42.*

*Providemus Ecclesie tali de tali Persona, & præficimus eum in Patrem, & Pastorem & Episcopum ejusdem Ecclesie, committentes ei administrationem in temporalibus & spiritualibus; in nomine, &c. Ibid.*

*In Ecclesia militanti, qua instar triumphantis habet, unus est omnium moderator & arbiter Jesu Christi vicarius, à quo tanquam capite omnis in subiecta membra potestas & auctoritas derivatur, qua à Christo Domino sine medio in ipsum infuit. P. Pius II. in Bull. Retract.*

The rule of the Church (saith Bellarmine) is Monarchical; therefore all authority is in one, and from him is derived to others; the which Aphorism he well proveth from the form of creating Bishops, as they call it, *We do provide such a Church with such a person; and we do prefer him to be Father and Pastour and Bishop of the said Church; committing to him the administration in temporals and spirituals in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*

Pope Pius II. in his Bull of Retraction, thus expresseth the sense of his See, *In the militant Church, which resembleth the triumphant, there is one moderatour and Judge of all, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, from whom, as from the Head, all power and authority is derived to the subiect members; the which doth immediately flow into it from the Lord Christ.*

A Congregation of Cardinals appointed by Pope Paulus III. speaking after the style and sentiments of that See, did say to him, *Your Holiness doth so bear the care of Christ's Church, that you have very many Ministers, by which you manage that care, these are all the Clergy, on whom the service of God is charged; especially Priests, and more especially Curates, and above all Bishops.*

*Sanctitas vestra ita gerit curam Ecclesie Christi, ut Ministros plurimos habeat, per quos curam exerceat; hi autem sunt Clerici omnes, quibus mandatus est cultus Dei; Presbyteri præsertim, & maximè Curati, & præ omnibus Episcopi — apud Cham. de Pont. Occum. 10, 13.*

*Summus Pontifex caput est omnium Pontificum, à quo isti tanquam à capite membra descendunt, & de cujus plenitudine omnes accipiunt quod ipse vocat in partem sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis. Durand. Mimar. Offic. 2. 1. 27.*

Durandus Bishop of Mande, according to the sense of his Age, saith, *The Pope is head of all Bishops, from whom they as members from an head descend, and of whose fulness all receive; whom he calls to a participation of his care, but admits not into the fulness of his power.*

This pretence is seen in the ordinary Titles of Bishops, who style themselves Bishops of such a Place, *By the Grace of God and of the Apostolick See.* O shame!

The men of the Tridentine Convention (those great betrayers of the Church to perpetual slavery, and Christian truth to the prevalency of falshood, till God pleaseth) do upon divers occasions, pretend to qualifie and empower Bishops to perform important matters, originally belonging to the Episcopal Function, as the Pope's Delegates.

*This was an expedient. Vid. Concil.*

But contrariwise according to the Doctrine of Holy Scripture, and the sense of the Primitive Church, the Bishops and Pastours of the Church do immediately receive their Authority and Commission from God; being onely his Ministers.

The Scripture calleth them *the Ministers of God, and of Christ* (so *Col. 1. 7. 4. 7.*  
*Epaphras, so Timothy, in regard to their Ecclesiastical function are named*) *1 Thess. 3. 2.*  
*the Stewards of God, the Servants of God, Fellow-servants of the Apostles.* *1 Tim. 4. 6.*  
*Tir. 1. 7.*

The Scripture saith, that *the Holy Ghost had made them Bishops to feed* *2 Tim. 2. 24.*  
*the Church of God, that God had given them, and constituted them in the* *Act 20. 28.*  
*Church; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the* *Naz. Or. 30.*  
*edifying of the body of Christ; that is, to all effects* *Eph. 4. 11.*  
*and purposes concerning their Office: for the work* *1 Cor. 12. 29.*  
*of the Ministry comprizeth all the duty charged*

*Ordo confertur à Deo immediate, jurisdictione mediate. Bell. 4. 25.*

on them whether in way of order or of governance; as they now  
do precariously and groundlessly in reference to this case distinguish.  
And *edifying the body* doth import all the designed effects of their  
Office; particularly those which are consequent on the use of Juris-  
diction; the which Saint Paul doth affirm was appointed for edifi-  
cation; \* according (saith he) to the Authority which God hath Given  
me for edification, and not for destruction. They do † *preside in the Lord.*

They allow no other Head but our Lord, || *from whom all the body, &c.*

The Fathers clearly do express their Sentiments to be the same.  
St. Ignatius saith, that the Bishop doth *preside in the place of God;*  
and that *we must look upon him as our Lord himself* (or as our Lord's  
Representative) that therefore *we must be subject to him as unto Jesus*  
*Christ.*

*Τὸν ὡς Ἐπίσκοπον δὴλον ὅτι ὡς αὐτοῦ ὃ Κύριον διὰ ἀποστολῆς Ign. ad Eph. "Ὁ δὲ Ἐπίσκοπος ἀποτάσσεται ὡς ὁ Χριστός." Ign. ad Trall.*

St. Cyprian affirmeth each Bishop to be constituted by the judgment of  
God, and of Christ; and that in his Church he is for the present a Judge  
in the place of Christ: —and that our Lord Jesus Christ, one and alone hath  
a power both to prefer us to the Government of his Church and to judge of  
our acting.

*prius Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex, vice Christi. Cypr. Ep. 55. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus & solus habet potestatem & proponendi nos in Ecclesia sua gubernationis, & de actis nostro judicandi Cypr. in Conc. Carthag.*

St. Basil, A Prelate is nothing else but one that sustaineth the person of  
Christ.

*ὁ τὸ σὺν ἡμῶν ἐπιτοκεῖν πρὸς πάντας. Bas. Const. Mon. cap. 22.*

St. Chrysostome, We have received the Commission of Ambassadors and  
come from God, for this is the dignity of the Episcopal Office.

*ἀδελφὸν καὶ ἡκούμεν ὅτι τὸ Θεῷ, τὸ πρὸς πάντας τὸ Ἐπισκοπικὸν ἀξίωμα. Chryf. in Coloss. Orat. 3.*

It behooveth us all who by divine authority are constituted in the Priest-  
hood to prevent, &c.

*Oportere nos omnes, qui Deo auctoritate sumus in Sacerdotio constituti illius certaminibus obviare, &c. Anatol. in Syn. Chalc. p. 512.*

Wherefore the ancient Bishops did all of them take themselves  
to be Vicars of Christ, not of the Pope, and no less than the proud-  
est Pope of them all; whence it was ordinary for them in their ad-  
dresses and compellations to the Bishop of Rome, and in their speech  
about him to call him their Brother, their Collegue, their Fellow mini-  
ster; which had not been modest, or just, if they had been his Mi-  
nisters or Shadows. Yea the Popes themselves, even the highest and  
haughtiest of them, who of any in old times did most stand on

*Leo Ep. 84.*

their presumed preeminence, did yet vouchsafe to call other Bishops their Fellow-Bishops and Fellow-ministers.

Sciesque nos non tuos esse ut te iustas & extollis Clericos, quos ut fratres & Co-episcopos recognoscere si elatio permitteret, debueras, Ann. Pith.

Those Bishops of France with good reason did complain of Pope Nicholas I. for calling them his Clerks; whenas, if his pride had suffered him, he should have acknowledged them for his Brethren and Fellow-Bishops.

In fine the ancient Bishops did not alledge any Commission from the Pope to warrant their Jurisdiction, but from God; If Moses his Chair were so venerable, that what was said out of that ought therefore to be heard, how much more is Christ's Throne so? we succeed him, from that we speak, since Christ has committed to us the ministry of reconciliation.

Ἡμεῖς τὴν — S. Chryl. sup.

Εἰ ὁ Μωϋσῆς θρόνος ὡς ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ ἐκείνου ἀκούοντες, οὐδὲ μὴ ἀκούοντες, οἱ δὲ Χριστοῦ θρόνος; ἐκείνου ἡμεῖς διαδοχόμεθα, ἀπὸ τούτου φησὶν ἡμεῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν διακονίαν τὴν καταλλαγῆς. Chryl. in Coloss. Orat. 3.

\* A ὅς ἐκμετρίσται ὁ ἱερεὺς, Θεὸς μὲν οὐκ ἐστιν ἀρχὴ, &c. Chryl. in Joh. Orat. 83.

\* Εὐαγγ. καὶ ἡμεῖς (ἀλλὰ τὸ συμβαίνει δι' αὐτοῦ) (I. πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν τὸ Θεὸν ἱεροῦργον τὸ εὐαγγ. καὶ ἐκμετρίσται) — Flavian in Chal. A.D. 1. p. 4.

That which is committed to the Priest, 'tis onely in God's power to give.

Since we also by the mercy of Christ our King and God were made Ministers of the Gospel.

This is a modern dream born out of Ambition and Flattery, which never came into the head of any ancient Divine.

It is a ridiculous thing to imagine, that Cyprian, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostome, Austin, &c. did take themselves for the Vicegerents or Ministers of the Popes; if they did, why did they not, so frequent occasion being given them, in all their Volumes, ever acknowledge it? why cannot Bellarmine and his Complices after all their prolling shew any passage in them importing any such acknowledgment; but are fain to infer it by far-fetched Sophisms, from Allegations plainly impertinent, or frivolous?

The Popes indeed in the Fourth Century began to practise a fine trick, very serviceable to the enlargement of their power; which was to confer on certain Bishops, as occasion served, or for continuance, the title of their Vicar or Lieutenant; thereby pretending to impart Authority to them: whereby they were enabled for performance of divers things, which otherwise by their own Episcopal or Metropolitcal power they could not perform. By which device they did engage such Bishops to such a dependence on them, whereby they did promote the Papal Authority in Provinces, to the oppression of the ancient Rights and Liberties of Bishops and Synods; doing what they pleased under pretence of this vast power communicated to them; and for fear of being displaced, or out of affection to their favourer doing what might serve to advance the Papacy.

Evagr. A.D. Eph. p. 134.

Thus did Pope Celestine constitute Cyril in his room.

Pope Leo appointed Anatolius of Constantinople.

A.D. Conc. sub. Menna. p. 70.

Pope Felix Acacius of Constantinople.

Pope Hormisdas Epiphanius of Constantinople.

Pope Simplicius to Zeno Bishop of Seville, We thought it convenient that you should be held up by the vicariat authority of our See.

Congruum duximus vicariis Sedis nostrae re auctoritate fulciri. Baron. Ann. 482 scilicet 46.

So did Siricius and his successors constitute the Bishops of Thessalonica to be their Vicars in the Diocese of Illyricum, wherein being then a member of the Western Empire they had caught a special Jurisdiction



jurisdiction; to which Pope Leo did refer in those words, which sometimes are impertinently alledged with reference to all Bishops, but concern onely *Anastafius* Bishop of *Theſſalonica*; We have entrusted thy Charity to be in our stead, so that thou art called into part of the solicitude, not into plenitude of the authority.

*Vices enim nostras ita tue credidimus  
charitati ut in partem sit vocatus soliti-  
tudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis.*  
P. Leo Ep. 84. (ad Anastaf. Theſſal.)

So did Pope *Zozimus* bestow a like pretence of Vicarious power upon the Bishop of *Arles*, which City was the seat of the temporal Exarch in *Gaule*. P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 93.

So to the Bishop of *Justiniana prima* in *Bulgaria* (or *Dardania Europa*) the like privilege was granted [by procurement of the Emperor *Justinian*, native of that place.]

Afterwards temporary or occasional Vicars were appointed (such as *Austin* in *England*, *Boniface* in *Germany*—) who in virtue of that concession did usurp a paramount authority; and by the exercise thereof did advance the Papal interest; depressing the authority of *Metropolitans*, and *Provincial Synods*.

So at length Legates, upon occasion dispatched into all Countries of the *West*, came to do there what they pleased, using that pretence to oppress and abuse both Clergy and People very intolerably.

Whence divers Countries were forced to make legal provisions for excluding such Legates, finding by much experience that their business was to rant and to domineer in the Pope's name, to suck money from the People, and to maintain luxurious pomp upon expence of the Countries where they came. P. Pasch II. Epist. apud Eadm p. 113, &c.

\* Of this *John XXII.* doth sorely complain; and decrees that all people should admit his Legates, under pain of interdicts.

\* *Extrau. commun. I. I. (p. 310.)*  
*Oculi inimici regni.* Matt. Par. p. 524.

In *England* Pope *Paschal* finds the same fault in his letter to King *Henry I.* *Nuncio's* or letters from the *Apostolick See*, unless by your Majesty's command, are not thought worthy any admittance or reception within your jurisdiction: none complains thence, none appeals thence for judgment to the *Apostolick See*.

*Sedis Apostolica nuncios vel littera præter jussum Regie Majestatis nullam in potestate tua susceptionem aut aditum promerentur, nullus inde clamor, nullum judicium ad sedem Apostolicam destinatur.*—P. Pasch. II. Eadm. p. 113.

The Pope observing what authority and reverence the Archbishops of *Canterbury* had in this Nation, whereby they might be able to check his attempts, did think good to constitute those Archbishops his Legates of course, (*Legatos natos*) that so they might seem to exercise their jurisdiction by authority derived from him, and owing to him that mark of favour, or honour, with enlargement of power, might pay him more devotion and serve his interests.

*Bellarmino* doth from this practice prove the Pope's Sovereign power, but he might from thence better have demonstrated their great cunning. It might from such extraordinary designation of Vicegerents with far more reason be inferred, that ordinarily Bishops are not his Ministers. Bell. 2. 10.

XI. It is the privilege of a Sovereign, that he cannot be called to account, or judged, or deposed, or debarr'd communion, or any-wise censured and punished; for this implieth a contradiction or confusion in degrees, subjecting the superiour to inferiours; this were making a river run backwards; this were to dam up the fountain of justice; to behead the State; to expose Majesty to contempt.

Wherefore the Pope doth pretend to this privilege, according to those *Maxims* in the *Canon Law*, drawn from the sayings of Popes (either forged or genuine, but all alike) obtaining authority of their Court.

Bell. 2. 26. de  
Cous. 2. 17.  
Grat. Dist. 40.  
cap. 6. Dist. 21.  
cap. 7. Caus. 9. qu. 3. cap. 10. — Extrav. comm. lib. 1. tit. 8. cap. 1. P. Leo IX. Ep. 1. cap. 10. — 17. P. Nich. 1. Ep. 8. (p. 504.) P. Joh. VIII. Ep. 75. (p. 31.) P. Gelaf. Ep. 4. (p. 625, 626.) Ep. 13. (p. 640.) P. Greg. VII. Ep. 8. Ep. 21.

And according to what P. Adrian let the 8th Synod know, because says he, the Apostolick Church of Rome stoops not to the judgment of lesser Churches. They cite also three old Synods (of *Sinuessæ*, of *Rome* under Pope *Silvester*, of *Rome* under *Sixtus III.*) but they are palpably spurious, and the learned amongst them confesse it.

Διὰ τὸ τὴν  
Ἀποστολικὴν  
Ἐκκλησίαν τῆς  
Ῥώμης τῇ  
ἐκκλησίᾳ μὴ ὑποκινῆται κρίσει. P. Adrian. in Syn. VIII. A.D. 7. pag. 963.

But antiquity was not of this mind; for it did suppose him no less obnoxious to judgment and correction than other Bishops, if he should notoriously deviate from the faith, or violate canonical discipline.

The Canons generally do oblige Bishops without exception to duty, and (upon defaultance) to correction: why is not he excepted, if to be excused, or exempted?

It was not questioned of old, but that a Pope in case he should notoriously depart from the faith, or notably infringe discipline, might be excommunicated: the attempting it upon divers occasions do shew their opinion, although it often had not effect because the cause was not just and plausible; the truth and equity of the case appearing to be on the Pope's side.

St. *Isidore Pelusiota* denieth of any Bishop's office that is ἀρχὴ ἀνυπακούουσα an uncontrollable government.

Ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ Περικράτους καὶ Βικτω-  
ρος ὡς ἡ ἀσπληνὴ πρὸς τὴν συνάχα-  
σιν ἐκκλησίαν παρ' ἀλλήλων ἐκ ἐξου-  
του. Epiph. har. 70. Audianorum.

Deum enim putat omnes ab se abstinere  
p. se, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.  
Firm. apud Cyr. Ep.

Διὰ τοῦτο μὲν Ἰωάννης ὁ καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ  
πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ὡς ἐκείνην  
ἐν αὐτῇ χειροτονήσαντων, εἰσὶν ὡς  
καὶ κοινωνίαν ἐκκλησίας ἀποσπασμένης  
ὅπως διδομένης τὰ νάρτια πρὸς ἐξουσίαν.  
Sozom. 3. 8.

Sozom. 3. 11.

Anathema tibi, Papa Liberi. Hil. fragm.

\* Ἐπίσκοπος ὁ καὶ ἀκαταστάτος ὑπα-  
ρξάντας καὶ τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ ὁ μὲν ἄλλος  
Ρώμης Ἀνδρόνικος. Evag. 2. 4.

† Niceph. 16. 17. Baron. Ann. 484 § 35.  
‡ Baron. A. 457. sect. 25.

\* *Africani Antistes Vigilium Rom.*  
Epif. damnatorum Capitulum Synoda-  
liter à Catholica communione, reservato  
ei penitentiae loco, recludunt. (l. exclu-  
dunt) Viët. Tun. post Conf. Basilii V. C.  
Ann. 10.

† Plat. p. 131. & Dist. 19. cap. 21, 22.

‡ Plat. p. 223.

\* Plat. p. 291.

† P. Pelag. II. Ep. 3. 13.

In the times of *Polycrates* and Pope *Victor* the whole *Eastern Church* did forbear communion with the Pope. *Firmilian* told Pope *Stephanus*, that by conceiting he might excommunicate all other Bishops, he had excommunicated himself. The Fathers of the *Antiochene Synod* did threaten to excommunicate and depose Pope *Julius*. They did promise to *Julius*, peace and communion, if he did admit the deposition of those whom they had expelled, and the constitution of those whom they had ordained; but if he did resist their decrees, they denounced the contrary. The *Oriental Bishops* at *Sardica* did excommunicate and depose him. St. *Hilary* did anathematize Pope *Liberius*, upon his defection to the *Arians*. \* *Dioscorus* did attempt to excommunicate Pope *Leo*. † *Acacius* of *Constantinople* renounced the communion of Pope *Felix*. ‡ *Timotheus Aelurus* cursed the Pope. \* The *African Bishops* did Synodically excommunicate Pope *Vigilius*. † Pope *Anastasius* was rejected by his own Clergy. ‡ Pope *Constantine* by the people, and so was \* Pope *Leo VIII*. † Divers Bishops of *Italy* and *Illyricum* did abstain from the Pope's communion for a long time, because they did

did admit the fifth Synod. || *Photius* did excommunicate and depose Pope *Nicholas I.* \* *Maurinus* Bishop of *Ravenna* did anathematize Pope *Vitalianus*. † The Emperour *Otho II.* having with good advice laboured to reclaim Pope *John XII.* without effect did indict a Council, calling together the Bishops of *Italy*, by the judgment of whom the life of that wicked man should be judged; and the issue was, that he was deposed. || Pope *Nicholas I.* desired to be judged by the Emperour. The fifth Synod did in general terms condemn Pope *Vigilius*, and the Emperour *Justinian* did banish him for not complying with the decrees of it. The sixth and seventh General Synods did anathematize *Honorius* by name; when he was dead, because his heresie was not before confuted; and they would have served him so, if he had been alive. Divers Synods (that of *Worms*, of *Papia*, of *Brescia*, of *Mentz*, of *Rome*, &c.) did reject Pope *Gregory VII.* Pope *Adrian* himself in the VIII. Synod (so called) did confess that a Pope being found deviating from the faith might be judged, as *Honorius* was. *Gerbertus* (afterward Pope *Sylvester II.*) did maintain that Popes might be held as *Ethnicks* and *Publicans*, if they did not bear the Church. The Synod of *Constance* did judge add depose three Popes.

The Synod of *Basil* did depose Pope *Eugenius*; affirming that *The Catholick Church hath often corrected and judged Popes when they either err'd from the faith, or by their ill manners became notoriously scandalous to the Church.*

The practice of Popes to give an account of their faith (when they entred upon their office) to the other Patriarchs and chief Bishops, approving themselves thereby worthy and capable of communion, doth imply them liable to judgment. Of the neglect of which practice *Euphemius* Bishop of *Constantinople* did complain.

Of this we have for example the *Synodical Epistles* of Pope *Gregory I.*

XII. To the Sovereign in Ecclesiastical affairs it would belong to define and decide controversies in faith, discipline, moral practice; so that all were bound to admit his definitions, decisions, interpretations. He would be the supreme Interpreter of the divine law, and Judge of controversies. No point or question of moment should be decided without his cognizance. This he therefore doth pretend to; taking upon him to define points, and requiring from all submission to his determinations. Nor doth he allow any Synods to decide questions.

But the ancients did know no such thing. In case of Contentions, they had no recourse to his judgment; they did not stand to his opinion, his authority did not avail to quash disputes. They had recourse to the Holy Scriptures, to Catholick Tradition, to reason, they disputed and discussed points by dint of argument.

*Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Vincentius Lirinensis* and others discoursing of the methods to resolve points of Controversie, did not reckon the Pope's

|| Κατάγειτον ὡς ἐχθροὺς καὶ ἀνὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁδριανῷ πατριῶτι Νικόλαο. Vit. Ignatii. Patr. apud Bin. p. 892. Baron. Ann. 863. —

\* Baron. Ann. 669. sess. 2.

— Communi totius Sancti Concilii consensu depositus. Luitprand. 6. 6.

† — Concilium indicit, convocatis Episcopis Italiae, quorum iudicio vita sceleratissimi hominis judicaretur. Plat. in Joh. 13. (pro. XII.) vid Baron. Ann. 960. & Binium.

| Grat. Caus. 2. qu. 7. cap. 41.

Ann. 1076.

Vid. Baron.

Ann. 1033.

sess. 3.

Baron. Ann.

992 sess. 44. —

Conc. Bas. Sess.

38. (p. 101.)

Ecclesia Catholica saepenumero summos Pontifices sive a fide delirantes, sive pravis moribus notoria Ecclesiam scandalizantes correxit, & judicavit. Conc. Bas. Sess. 12.

Mos est Romana Ecclesia sacerdoti noviter constituto formam fidei suae ad sanctas Ecclesias praeferre. P. Gelaf. Ep. 1. ad Laur.

Gelas. Ep. 9. Baron. Ann. 492. sess. 10.

Vid. tract. de Unit. Eccl.



Pope's authority for one. Divers of the Fathers did not scruple openly to dissent from the opinions of Popes; nor were they wondred at, or condemned for it.

Gall. 2. 11.  
avte: lu

So Saint Paul did withstand Saint Peter. So Polycarpus dissented from Pope Elutherius. So Polycrates from Pope Victor. So St. Cyprian from Pope Stephen. So Dionysius Alex. from Pope Stephen: all which persons were renowned for wisdom and piety in their times.

Highest Controversies were appeased by Synods out of the Holy Scripture, Catholick Tradition, the Analogy of faith, and common Reason, without regard to the Pope. Divers Synods in *Africk* and *Asia* defined the point about rebaptization without the Pope's leave, and against his opinion. The Synod of *Antioch* condemned the doctrine of *Paulus Samosatenus*, without intervention of the Pope; before they gave him notice. In the Synod of *Nice* the Pope had very small stroke. The General Synod of *Const.* declared the Point of the *Divinity* of the *H. Ghost* against *Macedonius*, without the Pope; who did no more than afterward consent: This the Synod of *Chalcedon* in their compellation to the Emperour

Καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ Σαρδικῇ καὶ ἄλλοι Ἀγιοὶ  
ἐκ τῶν ἀγιοποιήσας τὰς ἐν Ἀνατολῇ  
τῶν κείων ἐκείνων, οἱ ὅ ἐλαύθη τὴν  
Ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνης ἐκείνης τῆς ἐν  
Ἰουδαίας τῆς ἐκείνης τῆς ἐκείνης  
conc. Chalced. ad Marc. Orat. p. 468.

Marcian did observe. The Fathers met in *Sardica* to suppress the reliques of *Arianism*, communicated their decrees to the Eastern Bishops; and they who here discovered the pestilence of *Apolinarius*, made known theirs to the Western.

The Synod of *Africk* defined against *Pelagius*, before their informing Pope *Innocentius* thereof; not seeking his judgment, but desiring his consent to that, which they were assured to be truth.

Divers Popes have been incapable of deciding Controversies, themselves having been erroneous in the questions controverted: as Pope *Stephanus* (in part,) Pope *Liberius*, P. *Felix*, P. *Vigilius*, P. *Honorius*, &c. And in our opinion all Popes for many ages.

It is observable how the Synod of *Chalcedon* in their allocution to the

ὅς ἐστιν πᾶς ὁ πῶς ἐκείνους ἡ νεο-  
μισθία ἡ ὁπότε δὲ διαβόλη τὴν συν-  
ταξιν. Aff. Syn. Chal. p. 465.

Μὴ τινὲς ἡμῶν τῇ Σαρδικῇ τὸν Ρόμης  
ἐκείνους τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν, ὡς κινουμένης  
ἐκείνης, ἀποστρέψαντες ἀλλὰ εἰ μὴ  
συμφωνῇ τὸ ῥησὶς, ἐκείνης τῶν  
εἰ μὴ τῶν ἐκείνης τῶν ἐκείνης  
εἰ μὴ τῶν ἐκείνης τῶν ἐκείνης  
τῶν

Emperour *Marcian* do excuse P. *Leo* for expounding the faith, in his *Epistle* (the which it seems some did reprehend as a novel method disagreeable to the Canons;) Let not them (say they) object to us the *Epistle* of the marvellous *Prelate* of *Rome*, as obnoxious to imputation of novelty; but if it be not consonant to the Scriptures, let them confute it; or if it be not consentaneous to the Fathers who have preceded; or if it be not apt to confute the irreligious, &c.

It was not his judicial authority, which they did insist upon, to maintain his *Epistle*, but the orthodoxie and intrinseck usefulness of it to confute errors; upon which account they did embrace and confirm it by their suffrage.

XIII. If the Pope were a Sovereign of the Church as they make him, it were at least expedient that he should be infallible; for why otherwise should he undertake confidently to pronounce in all cases, to define high and difficult Points, to impose his Dictates, and require assent from all; If he be fallible, it is very probable that often he doth obtrude errors upon us for matters of Faith and Practice.

Bell. lib. 4.

Wherefore the true fast friends of Papal interest do assert him to be infallible, when he dictateth as Pope, and setting himself into his Chair doth

doth thence mean to instruct the whole Church. And the Pope therefore himself, who countenanceth them, may be presumed to be of that mind.

*Pighius* said bouncingly, *The judgment of the Apostolick See with a Council of domestick Priests, is far more certain than the judgment of an universal Council of the whole earth without the Pope.*

*Longe certius est unius Apostolicae Sedis cum Concilio domesticorum Sacerdotum iudicium, quam sine Pontifice iudicium universalis Concilii totius Orbis terrarum. Pighius de Hier. lib. 6.*

This is the Syllogism we propose:

*The supreme Judge must be infallible,*

*The Pope is not infallible, Therefore.*

The Major the Jesuits, Canonists and Courtiers are obliged to prove, it being their Assertion; and they do prove it very wisely and strongly.

The Minor is asserted by the French Doctors, and they do with clear evidence maintain it:

The Conclusion we leave them to infer who are concerned.

It is in effect Pope Gregory's Argumentation; No Bishop can be Universal Bishop, (or Universal Pastour and Judge of the Church) because no Bishop can be Infallible; for that the lapse of such a Pastour would throw down the Church into ruine, by error and impiety. Therefore the Universal Church, which God forbid, falls, when he falls who is call'd Universal. —The State and order of our Lord's family will decay when that which is required in the body is not to be found in the head.

*Universa ergo Ecclesia, quod absit, a statu suo corruit, quando is qui vocatur Universalis cadit. Greg. M. Epist. 4. 32. Totius familiae Domini status & ordo mutabit, si quod requiritur in corpore, non inveniat in capite. P. Leo Ep. 87.*

But that he is not infallible, much experience and History do abundantly shew.

The Ancients knew no such pretender to infallibility; otherwise they would have left disputing; and run to his Oracular Dictates for information. They would have onely asserted this point against Hereticks. We should have had Testimonies of it innumerable. It had been the most famous point of all.

*In nullo aliter sapere quam res se habet angelica perfectio est.*

*Aug. de Bab. c. 25. Not to think of a thing otherwise than 'tis, is an angelical perfection.*

I will not mention Pope *Stephanus* universally approving the Baptism of Hereticks against the Decrees of the Synod of Nice and other Synods. Nor Pope *Liberius* complying with *Arianism*. Nor Pope *Innocent I.* and his followers at least till Pope \* *Gelasius* first asserting the Communion of Infants for needfull. Nor Pope *Vigilius* dodging with the Fifth Synod. Nor Pope *Honorius* condemned by so many Councils and Popes for *Monothelism*. But surely Pope *Leo* and Pope *Gelasius* were strangely deceived; when they condemned Partaking in one kind. Pope *Gregory* was foully out, when he condemned the worship of Images; and when he so declaimeth against the title of Universal Bishop; and when he avowed himself a Subject to the Emperour *Mauritius*; and when he denied the Books of *Maccabees* to be Canonical; and when he asserted the perfection of Holy Scripture. Pope *Leo II.* was mistaken, when he did charge his infallible Predecessour *Honorius* of *Monothelism*. Pope *Nicholas* was a little deceived when he determined the \* *attrition* of Christ's Body. Pope *Urban II.* was out, when he allowed it || lawful for good Catholics to commit murder on Persons excommunicate. Pope *Innocent IV.* erred, when he called Kings, *The Pope's slaves.*

If many Popes had been writers, we should have had more errors to charge them with.

\* *Grat. de Consecr. dist. 2. cap. 42*

|| *Grat. Caus. 23. qu. 5. cap. 47.*

*Mancia Papa Matt. Paris. Ann. 1253.*

Surely

Surely those Popes did err, who confirmed the Synods of *Constance* and *Basil*; not excepting the determinations in favour of General Councils being Superiour to Popes. All those Popes have devilishly erred, who have pretended to dispose of Kingdoms, to depose Princes: to absolve Subjects of their Oaths. Pope *Adrian II.* did not take the Pope to be infallible, when he said he might not be judged, excepting the case of *Heretic*; and thereby excuseth the *Oriental*s for anathematizing *Honorius*, he being accused of *Heretic*.

Joh. 22 Ger-  
son. Serm. in  
Pasch. occurr.  
Celestinus.—  
Alph. à Ca-  
stro. Har. 1. 4.  
Bin. Tom. 7.  
p. 994.

P. Greg. VII. Ep. lib. 3. 7. *Simoniaca*  
*heresi*.

P. Jul. II. Conc. Lat. Sess. 5. (p. 57.)

Idem electus non Apostolicus, sed Apo-  
stolicus, & tanquam *heresiarcha*, &c.  
Ibid. Tract. 4. §. 12. & sect. 16.

Decernimus, quod— sed etiam contra  
dictum sic electum vel assumptum à *Simo-  
niaca* labe opponi & excipi possit sicut de  
vera & indubitata *heresi*—

\* Omne Papale negotium manus agunt,  
quem dabo mihi de tota maxima Urbe,  
qui se in Papam receperit pretio non inter-  
cedente? Bern. de Confid. 4. 2.

There is one *Heretic*, of which, if all Histories do not lie grievously, divers Popes have been guilty; a *Heretic* defined by divers Popes; the *Heretic* of *Simony*; How many such Hereticks have sate in that Chair? of which how many Popes are proclaimed guilty with a loud voice in History? The hand, says St. \* Bernard, does all the Papal business, shew me a man in all this greatest City who would admit thee to be Pope without the mediation of a bribe? Yea how few for some Ages have been guiltless of this *Heretic*? It may be

answered, they were no Popes because their Election was null; but then the Church hath often and long been without a Head. Then numberless Acts have been void; and Creations of Cardinals have been null; and consequently there hath not probably been any true Pope for a long time.

In the judgment of so many great Divines, which did constitute the Synod of *Basil*, many Popes (near all surely) have been Hereticks; who have followed or countenanced the opinion that Popes are superiour to General Councils; the which there is flatly declared

A fide devotus, pertinax hereticus—  
Concil. Basil. Sess. 34 p. 96. & p. 107.

*Heretic*. Pope *Eugenius* by name was there declared a *pertinacious Heretic*, deviating from the faith—

It often happeneth that the Pope is not skilled in *Divinity*, as Pope *Innocent X.* was wont to profess concerning himself (to wave discourse about Theological points) he therefore cannot pronounce, in use of ordinary means, but only by miracle, as *Balaam's* Ass. So Pope

Le Pape respondit, che le Vicario de J.  
C. ne estoit point obligé d'examiner toutes  
choses par la dispute; que la verité de ses  
decrets dependoit seulement de l'Inspiration  
divine. Memor. Hist. de 5. Propos.

*Innocent X.* said, that the Vicar of *Jesus Christ* was not obliged to examine all things by dispute; for that the truth of his decrees depended only on divine Inspiration: what is this but downright *Quakerism*, *Enthusiasm*, *Imposture*?

Pope *Clemens V.* did not take himself to be infallible, when in his great Synod of *Vienna*, the question, whether beside remission of sin, also virtue were conferred to Infants, he resolved thus very honestly, —The second opinion, which says that informing grace and virtues are in baptism conferred both upon infants and adult persons, we think fit with the consent of the holy council to be chosen; as being more probable, and more consonant and agreeable to the *Divinity* of the modern Doctors.

— Opinionem secundam, quæ dicit  
tam parvulis quàm adultis conferri in bap-  
tismo informantem gratiam & virtutes,  
tanquam probabiliorem ac Doctorum mo-  
dernorum Theologiæ magis consonam & con-  
cordem sacro approbante Concilio duximus  
eligendam. Clem. in Tit. 1.

Which of the two Popes were in the right, Pope *Nicholas IV.* who decided that our Lord was so poor that he had right to nothing, or Pope *John XXII.* who declared this to be a *Heretic*, charging our Lord with injustice?

Bell. 4. 24. (p. 1318)

Confer. Sext. lib. 5. tit. 12. cap. 3

Extrav. Joh. XXII. tit. 14. cap. 3, 4, 5.



XIV. A Sovereign is in Dignity and Authority Superiour to any number of Subjects, however conjoined or congregated; as a Head is above all the Members however compacted; He is not Supreme, who is any-wise subject or inferiour to a Senate, or any Assembly in his Territory.

Therefore the Pope doth claim a Superiority over all Councils; Bellarmin. de Concil. 2. 15. pretending that their determinations are invalid without his consent and confirmation; that he can rescind or make void their Decrees; that he can suspend their Consultations, and translate or dissolve them.

And Baronius reckons this as one error in Hincmarus Bishop of Rhemes, that he held as if the canons of Councils were of greater authority in the Church of God than the decrees of Popes, which, says he, how absurd and unreasonable an opinion it is, &c.

That the Authority of the Apostolick See in all Christian Ages has been preferred before the universal Church, both the Canons of our predecessors and manifold tradition do confirm.

This is a question stiffly debated among Romanists; but the most (as Æneas Sylvius, afterward Pope Pius II. did acutely observe) with good reason do adhere to the Pope's side, because the Pope disposeth of Benefices, but Councils give none.

But in truth anciently the Pope was not understood Superiour to Councils: for greater is the Authority of the world than of one city, says St. Hierome. He was but one Bishop, that had nothing to doe out of his precinct. He had but his Vote in them; He had the first Vote, as the Patriarch of Alexandria the second, of Antioch the third--- but that order neither gave to him or them any advantage, as to decision; but common consent, or the suffrages of the majority did prevail. He was conceived Subject to the Canons no less than other Bishops. Councils did examine matters decreed by him, so as to follow or forsake them as they saw cause. The Popes themselves did profess great veneration and observance of Conciliar Decrees. Pope Leo I. did oppose a Cannon of the Synod of Chalcedon, (not pretending his Superiority to Councils, but the inviolability of the Nicene Canons) but it notwithstanding that opposition did prevail.

Even in the Dregs of times, when the Pope had clambred so high to the top of power, this Question in great numerous Synods of Bishops was agitated, and positively decided against him; both in Doctrine and practice.

The Synod of Basil affirmeth the matter of these Decrees to be a verity of the Christian faith, which whoever doth pertinaciously resist, is to be deemed a heretick--- Those Fathers say that none of the skilfull did ever doubt of this truth, that the Pope in things belonging to faith, was subject to the judgment of the same General Councils--- that the Council has an authority immediately from Christ which the Pope is bound to obey. Those Synods were confirmed by Popes, without exception of those determinations.

Plane significat majoris esse auctoritatis in Ecclesia Dei Canones Conciliorum decretis Pontificum: hæc quàm sint absurda & ab omni ratione penitus aliena, &c. Baron. ad. Ann. 992. Sess. 56. Concil. Later. V. Sess. 11. p. 152.

Th. Cajet. Orat. in Conc. Lat. p. 36. Apostolica vix Sedis auctoritas, quod cunctis sculis Christianis Ecclesia prælatæ sit universæ, & canonum serie paternorum, & multiplici traditione firmatar. P. Gelat. I. Ep. 8. (O impudentiam!)

Major est auctoritas orbis quàm urbis. Hier. ad Evag.

Concil. Const. Sess. 4. (p. 1003.) Concil. Basl. Sess. 33.

Veritas Catholica fidei, cui pertinaciter repugnans est consensus hereticus Concil. Basl. Sess. 33.

Nec unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit summum Pontificem in his quæ fidem concernunt judicio eorundem Conciliorum universalium esse subiectum. Conc. Basl. decret. p. 117.

Concilium habet potestatem immediatam à Christo, cui Papa obedire tenetur --- Conc. Basl. Sess. 38. p. 101.

Great Churches, most famous Universities, a mighty store of learned Doctors of the Roman Communion have revered those Councils, and adhered to their Doctrine. Infomuch that the Cardinal of Lorrain did affirm him to be an Heretick in France, who did hold the contrary.

These things sufficiently demonstrate that the Pope cannot pretend to Supremacy by universal Tradition; and if he cannot prove it by that, how can he prove it? not surely by Scripture, nor by Decrees of ancient Synods, nor by any clear and convincing reason.

XV. The Sovereign of the Church is by all Christians to be acknowledged the chief Person in the world, inferiour and subject to none; above all commands; the greatest Emperor being his Sheep and Subject.

As in Israel He therefore now doth pretend to be above all Princes. Divers Popes have affirmed this Superiority. They are allowed and most favoured by him, who teach this Doctrine. In their Missal he is preferred above all Kings, being prayed for before them.

But in the primitive times this was not held; for St. Paul requires every soul to be subject to the higher powers. Then the Emperor was a-

vowed the first person, next to God; To whom, says Tertullian, they are second, after whom they are first, before all and above all Gods. Why? &c. —we worship the Emperor as a man next to God, and less onely than God. And Optatus, — since there is none above the Emperor but God who made him. — while Donatus extolled himself above the Emperor, he raises himself as it were above humanity, and thinks himself to be God and not Man. For the King is the top and head of all things on earth. Then even \* Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, all men whoever were subject to the Emperor. The Emperours did command them, † even the blessed Bishops and Patriarchs of old Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Theopolis and Jerusalem. Divers Popes did avow themselves subject to the Emperor.

— à quo sunt secundi, post quem primi ante omnes, & super omnes Deus; quidni? cum super omnes homines, qui utique vivunt. Tertul. Apol. cap. 30.

Colimus Imperatorem ut hominem à Deo secundum, & solo Deo minorem. Tertul. ad Scap. cap. 2.

Cum se Donatus super Imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem. Opt. 3. Vid. Tr. 5. Sect. 14.

Dum se Donatus super Imperatorem extollit, jam quasi hominum excesserat modum ut se ut Deum non hominem aestimaret. Id. Ibid.

Βασιλεὺς γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐστὶν ὁ Χρῆστος. Chrys. Anaph. β. p. 463.

\* Chrys. in Rom. 13. 1.

† Jubemus igitur beatissimos Episcopos & Patriarchas hoc est senioris Romae, & Constantinopolis, & Alexandriæ, & Theopolis & Hierosolymorum. Justinian. Novel. 123. cap. 3. P. Greg. M. Ep. 2. 62. Supra in pref. Sect. 4. Tract. 5. Sect. 14.

Vid. Sect. 5.

Dist. 63. c. 4. Branch of Supremacy which the Pope doth assume.

P. Nic. 1. Ep. Baronius saith that this was the ancient custome; and that Pope Simplicius did confirm the Election of Calendion Bishop of Antioch.

Ἐὰν εὐλαβῶν τὸν ἁγίου πνεύματος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Theod. 5. 8.

Meletius confirm'd the most holy Gregory in the Bishoprick of Constantinople.

But the truth is, that anciently Bishops being elected did onely give an account of their choice unto all other Bishops; especially to those of highest rank, desiring their approbation and friendship, for preservation of due communion, correspondence and peace. So the Synod of Antioch gave an account to the Bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and all their Fellow-ministers throughout the world, &c. of the election of Dominus after Paulus Samosatenus. So the Fathers of Constantinople acquainted Pope Damasus and the Western Bishops with the Constitution of Nectarius, Flavianus, &c.

Καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οὐκ ἐκείνην ἀλλὰ πάντας τοὺς ἐπίσκοπους. Euseb. 7. 30.

of the election of Dominus after Paulus Samosatenus. So the Fathers of Constantinople acquainted Pope Damasus and the Western Bishops with the Constitution of Nectarius, Flavianus, &c.

This

This was not to request Confirmation, as if the Pope or other Bishops could reject the Election if regular, but rather to assure whom they were to communicate with. *We have* (say the Fathers of the Synod against Paulus Samosatenus) *signified this, (our chusing of Domnus into Paulus's room) that you may write to him and receive letters of communion from him---* And St. Cyprian; *That you and our Collegues may know to whom they may write, and from whom they may receive letters.*

Thus the Bishops of Rome themselves did acquaint other Bishops with their Election, their Faith, &c. So did Cornelius; whom therefore S. Cyprian asserteth as established by the consent and approbation of his Collegues; *When the place of Peter and the Sacerdotal Chair was void, which by God's will being occupied, and with all our consents confirmed, &c. — and the testimony of our Fellow-bishops, the whole number of which all over the world unanimously consented.*

The Emperour did confirm Bishops, as we see by that notable passage in the Synod of Chalcedon; where Bassianus, Bishop of Ephesus, pleading for himself faith, *Our most religious Emperour knowing these things presently ratified it, and by a memorial published it, confirming the Bishoprick; afterwards he sent his rescript by Eustathius the Silentiary again confirming it.*

Ἐν ἡρώσιμῳ τε οὐκ ὅπως τὰ τοῦ γρά-  
σαντος, καὶ τὰ ὅσα τότε καὶ ὡς ἐκείνῳ  
γεγραμμένα. — Euseb. Ibid.

Ut scires tu, & Collegæ nostri quibus  
scribere, & literas mutuo à quibus nos  
accipere oporteret — Cypr. Ep. 55 (ad  
Cornel.)

Cum locus Petri, & gradus Cathedra  
Sacerdotalis vacaret, quo occupato de Dei  
voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensu  
firmato — Cypr. Ep. 52.

— & Co-episcoporum testimonio, quo-  
rum numerus universus per totum mundum  
concordi unanimitate consensit. Ibid.

Γὰρ ὅτι ταῦτα ὁ εὐσεβὴς βασιλεὺς ἡμεῶν  
ἰσχυρῶς, ἐκείνους τὰς αὐτῶν ἐβεβαίωσεν, καὶ  
ἐκείνους διὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἐν ὁμο-  
νομίᾳ, βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ ταῦτα  
ἀποστολὴν παλάσσει πάλιν καὶ Εὐστάθιῳ τῷ  
Σιλενταρίῳ ἐβεβαίωσεν τῇ αὐτῇ Ἐπισκοπῇ.  
Conc. Chalced. Act. 11. (p. 404.)

XVII. It is a Privilege of Sovereigns to grant Privileges, Exemptions, Dispensations.

This he claimeth; but against the Laws of God and Rights of Bishops. Against the Decrees of Synods---against the sense of good men in all times.

XVIII. It is a Prerogative of Sovereign power, to Erect, Translate Spiritual Presidencies.

Wherefore this the Pope claimeth. *Cum ex illo, &c.*

But at first he had nothing to do therein, except in his own Province or Diocese.

As Christianity did grow and enter into Cities, so the neighbour Bishops did ordain Bishops there.

Princes often, as they did endow, so they did erect Episcopal Sees and did, as was futable, change places.

Pope Paschal II. doth by complaining attest to this, writing to the Archbishop of Poland, *What shall I say of the translations of Bishops, which among you are presumed to be made, not by Apostolick authority, but the King's command.*

P. Innoc. III. in  
Greg. decr. li. 1.  
tit. 7 c. 1. — &c.

Quid super  
Episcoporum  
translationibus  
loquar, quæ  
apud vos non

authoritate Apostolica, sed natu Regis presumuntur? P. Pasch. II. Ep. 6. Præter auctoritatem nostram Episcoporum translationes presumuntur — Eadm. p. 115.

XIX. It is a great Prerogative of Sovereignty to impose Taxes on the Clergy or People.

Wherefore the Pope doth assume this; as for instance that Decree of Pope Innocent IV. in the first Synod of Lyons; *By the common consent of the Council we ordain that all the Clergy, as well those who are under authority as the Prelates, pay for three years a twentieth part of their Ecclesiastical*



Ceterum ex communi Concilii approbatione statuimus, ut omnes omnino Clerici, tam subditi quam prelati, vigesimam Ecclesiarum proventuum usque ad triennium conferant in subsidium terre sanctæ, per manus eorum, qui ad hoc Apostolicæ fuerint providentiæ ordinati. — sciëntque se omnes ad hoc fideliter observandum per excommunicationis sententiam obligatos. Lugdun. Concil. 1. (Anno 1245.)

Ut dicentur  
Oblationibus  
Matronarum.

Marcell. 27. Vid. Const. Apost. 2. 25. Nam qui constituerent vel fundarunt sanctissimas Ecclesias pro sua salute & communis Reipublicæ, reliquerunt illis substantias, ut per eas debeant sacra liturgia fieri, & ut illis à ministrantibus piis Clericis Deus colatur. Cod. Lib. 1. Tit. 3. Sect. 42.

stical revenues towards the assistance of the holy Land, into the hands of those who shall be thereto appointed by the prudence of the Apostolick See. — and let all know that this they are bound faithfully to do under pain of excommunication.

But Antiquity knew no such Impositions: when the Church, the Clergy, the Poor were maintained and relieved by voluntary Offerings, or Obventions.

Even the invidious splendour of the Roman Bishop was supported by the Oblations of Matrons, as Marcellinus observeth.

This is an encroachment upon the right of Princes, unto whom Clergymen are Subjects, and bound to render tribute to whom tribute belongeth.

## SUPPOSITION VII.

A farther grand Assertion of the Roman Party, is this, *That the Papal Supremacy is indefectible, and unalterable.*

**B**UT good reasons may be assigned, why even supposing that the Pope had an Universal Sovereignty in virtue of his Succession to Saint Peter conferred on him, it is not assuredly consequent, that it must always, or doth now belong to him. For it might be settled on him not absolutely but upon conditions, the which failing his authority may expire. It might be God's will that it should onely continue for a time. And there are divers ways, whereby according to common rules of justice, he might be disseised thereof.

1. If God had positively declared his will concerning this Point, that such a Sovereignty was by him granted irrevocably and immutably, so that in no case it might be removed or altered, then indeed it must be admitted for such; but if no such declaration doth appear, then to assert it for such is to derogate from his power and providence; by exemption of this case from it. It is the ordinary course of providence so to confer power of any kind or nature on men, as to reserve to himself the liberty of transferring it, qualifying it, extending or contracting it, abolishing it, according to his pleasure, in due seasons and exigencies of things. Whence no humane power can be supposed absolutely stable or immovably fixed in one person or place.

2. No power can have a higher source, or firmer ground, than that of the Civil Government hath, for all such power is from heaven, and in relation to that it is said, *There is no power but from God, the powers that are, are ordained by God:* But yet such power is liable to various alterations, and is like the Sea, having ebbs and flows, and ever changing its bounds either personal or local.

Any temporal Jurisdiction may be lost by those revolutions and vicissitudes of things, to which all humane Constitutions are subject; and which are ordered by the will and providence of the most High, who ruleth

Joh. 29. 11.  
Rom. 13. 1...

Dan. 5. 21.  
Psal. 75. 7

in the Kingdom of men, appointing over it whom he pleaseth; putting down one, and setting up another.

Adam By God's appointment was Sovereign of the world; and his first born Successours derived the same power from him: yet in course of time that order hath been interrupted, and divers independent Sovereignities do take place.

Every Prince hath his authority from God, or by virtue of Divine Ordination within his own Territory; and according to God's Ordinance the lawfull Successour hath a right to the same authority; yet by accidents such authority doth often fail totally or in part, changing its extent.

Why then may not any Spiritual power be liable to the same vicissitudes? why may not a Prelate be degraded as well as a Prince? why may not the Pope, as well as the Emperour, lose all, or part of his Kingdom?

Why may not the Successour of Peter, no less than the Heir of Adam suffer a defeiture of Jurisdiction?

That Spiritual Corporations, Persons and Places are subject to the same contingencies with others, as there is like reason to suppose, so there are examples to prove; God removed his sanctuary from Shiloh, Jer. 7. 12. Jer. 7. 14. Apoc. 2. 5. Go ye now unto my place, which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at first, &c. He deserted Jerusalem. He removeth the Candlesticks. He placed Eli (of the Family of Ithamar) in the High-Priesthood, and displaced his Race from it: I said indeed (saith God) that thy house, 1 Sam. 2. 30. 1 King. 2. 27. and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever, but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me, &c.

3. The reason and exigency of things might be sufficient ground for altering an Universal Jurisdiction; for when it should prove very inconvenient or hurtfull, God might order such an alteration to happen, and men be obliged to allow it.

As God first did institute one Universal Monarchy, but that form (upon the multiplication of mankind, and peopling of the earth) proving incommodious, providence gave way for its change, and setting up of particular Governments; to which men are bound to submit; So God might institute a singular Presidency of the Church; but when the Church grew vastly extended, so that such a Government would not conveniently serve the whole, he might order a division, in which we should acquiesce.

4. It hath ever been deemed reasonable, and accordingly been practised, that the Church in its exterior form and political administrations should be suited to the state of the world, and Constitution of worldly Governments that their might be no clashing or disturbance from each to other.

Wherefore seeing the World is now settled under so many Civil Sovereignities, it is expedient that Ecclesiastical Discipline should be so modelled, as to comply with each of them.

And it is reasonable, that any pretence of Jurisdiction should veil to the publick good of the Church and the World.

That it should be necessary for the Church to retain the same form of policy or measure of power affixed to persons or places, can nowise be demonstrated by sufficient proof, and it is not consistent with experience; which sheweth the Church to have subsisted with variations of that kind.

There

There hath in all times been found much reason or necessity to make alterations as well in the places and bounds of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, as of secular Empire.

Wherefore Saint *Peter's* Monarchy, reason requiring, might be cantonized into divers spiritual Supremacies; and as other Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions have been chopp'd and chang'd, enlarged or diminished, removed and extinguished, so might that of the *Roman* Bishop. The Pope cannot retain power in any State against the will of the Prince: he is not bound to suffer correspondences with Foreigners, especially such who apparently have interests contrary to his honour and the good of his people.

5. Especially that might be done if the continuance of such a Jurisdiction should prove abominably corrupt, or intolerably grievous to the Church.

6. That power is defectible which according to the nature and course of things doth sometime fail.

But the Papal Succession hath often been interrupted by contingencies (of *Sedition, Schism, Intrusion, Simoniack Election, Deposition, &c.* as before shewed) and is often interrupted by Vacancies from the death of the Incumbents.

7. If leaving their dubious and false suppositions, (concerning Divine Institution, Succession to Saint *Peter*, &c.) we consider the truth of the case, indeed the more grounded plea of the Pope, that Papal preeminence was obtained by the wealth and dignity of the *Roman* City, and by the collation or countenance of the Imperial authority; then by the defect of such advantages it may cease or be taken away: for when *Rome* hath ceased to be the Capital City, the Pope may cease to be Head of the Church. When the Civil powers, which have succeeded the Imperial, each in its respective Territory, are no less absolute than it, they may take it away, if they judge it fit; for whatever power was granted by humane Authority, by the same may be revoked; and what the Emperour could have done, each Sovereign power now may doe for it self.

An indefectible power cannot be settled by man; because there is no power ever extant at one time greater than there is at another; so that whatever power one may raise, the other may demolish; there being no bounds whereby the present time may bind all posterity.

However no humane Law can exempt any Constitution from the providence of God; which at pleasure can dissolve whatever man hath framed. And if the Pope were divested of all adventitious power, obtained by humane means, he would be left very bare; and hardly would take it worth his while to contend for Jurisdiction.

8. However or whencesoever the Pope had his authority, yet it may be forfeited by defects and defaults incurred by him.

If the Pope doth encroach on the rights and liberties of others usurping a lawless domination, beyond reason and measure, they may in their own defence be forced to reject him, and shake off his yoke.

If he will not be content to govern otherwise than by infringing the Sacred Laws, and trampling down the inviolable Privileges of the Churches, either granted by Christ, or established by the Sanctions of General Synods; he thereby depriveth himself of all Authority; because it cannot be admitted upon tolerable terms, without greater wrong of many others (whose right out-weigheth his) and without great mischief to the Church, the good of which is to be preferred before his private advantage.

This



This was the *Maxime* of a great Pope, a great stickler for his own dignity; for when the Bishop of *Constantinople* was advanced by a General Synod above his ancient pitch of dignity, that Pope opposing him did say, that *whoever doth affect more than his due, doth lose that which properly belonged to him*; the which Rule if true in regard to another's case, may be applied to the Pope, for *with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again*.

On such a supposition of the Papal encroachment, we may return his words upon him; *It is too proud and immoderate a thing to stretch beyond ones bounds, and in contempt of antiquity, to be willing to invade other mens right, and to oppose the Primacies of so many Metropolitans, on purpose to advance the dignity of one*.

For the privileges of Churches, being instituted by the Canons of the holy Fathers, and fixt by the Decrees of the venerable Synod of Nice, cannot be pluckt up by any wicked attempt, nor altered by any innovation.

Far be it from me, that I should in any Church infringe the Decrees of our Ancestours made in favour of my fellow-priests; for I do my self injury, if I disturb the rights of my brethren.

The Pope surely (according to any ground of Scripture, or Tradition, or ancient Law) hath no Title to greater Principality in the Church, than the Duke of *Venice* hath in that State; Now if the Duke of *Venice* in prejudice to the publick right and liberty, should attempt to stretch his power to an absoluteness of command, or much beyond the bounds allowed him by the constitution of that Common-wealth, he would thereby surely forfeit his Supremacy, (such as it is) and afford cause to the State of rejecting him: the like occasion would the Pope give to the Church by the like demeanour.

9. The Pope by departing from the Doctrine and Practice of Saint Peter, would forfeit his Title of Successour to him; for in such a case no succession in place or in name could preserve it; *The Popes themselves had swerved and degenerated from the example of Peter*.

*They are not the Sons of the Saints, who hold the places of the saints, but they that doe their works.* (Which place is rased out of St. Hierome.)

*They have not the inheritance of Peter, who have not the faith of Peter, which they tear asunder by ungodly division.*

So Gregory Nazianzene saith of Athanasius, that he was Successour of Mark, no less in piety than presidency: the which we must suppose to be properly succession: otherwise the Musfi of *Constantinople* is Successour to St. Andrew, of St. Chrysostome, &c. the Musfi of *Jerusalem* to St. James.

If then the Bishop of *Rome* instead of teaching Christian Doctrine doth propagate Errours contrary to it; If instead of guiding into Truth and Godliness, he seduceth into Falshood and Impiety; If instead of declaring and pressing the Laws of God, he delivereth and imposeth Precepts opposite, prejudicial, destructive of God's Laws; If instead of pro-

*Propria perdit, qui indebita concupiscit.*  
P. Leo. I. Ep. 54.

*Superbiam nimis est & immoderatum ultra fines proprios tendere, & antiquitate calcata alienum jus velle prærripere; utque unius crescat dignitas, tot Metropolitanz impugnare primatus.*—P. Leo. I. Ep. 55.

*Privilegia enim Ecclesiarum, sanctorum Patrum Canonibus instituta, & venerabilis Nicene Synodi fixa Decretis, nullâ possunt improbitate convelli, nullâ novitate mutari.* Ibid.

*Abstineat hoc à me, ut Statuta Majorum Consecratoribus meis in qualibet Ecclesiâ infringam, quia mihi injuriam facio, si fratrum meorum jura perturbo.* Greg. I. Epist. 2. 37.

*Pontifices ipsi à Petri vestigiis discesserant.* Plat. in Joh. 10. (p. 275.)

*Non Sanctorum Filii sunt, qui tenent loca Sanctorum, sed qui excent opera eorum.*—Hieron. ad Heliud. apud Grat. Dist. 40. cap. 2.

*Non habent Petri hereditatem qui Petri fidem non habent, quam impiâ divisione discernunt.* Ambr. de Gen. 1. 6.

Οὐχ ἡμῶν τ' Εὐαγγελιστῶν, ἢ τ' ἀποστόλων διαδοχῶν— ἢ διὰ τῆς κληρονομικότητος διαδοχῶν τὸ μὲν δὲ οὐκ ὁμοῦ καὶ ὁμοῦ δεσπ. τὸ δὲ ἀντιδοχῶν καὶ ἀντιδεσπῶν—  
Greg. Naz. Or. 21.

promoting genuine Piety, he doth (in some instances) violently oppose it: If instead of maintaining true Religion, he doth pervert and corrupt it by bold Defalcations, by Superstitious additions, by Foul mixtures and alloys; If he coineth new Creeds, Articles of Faith, new Scriptures, new Sacraments, new Rules of Life, obtruding them on the Consciences of Christians; If he conformeth the Doctrines of Christianity to the Interests of his Pomp and Profit; *making gain godliness*; If he prescribe Vain, Prophane, Superstitious ways of Worship, turning Devotion into Foppery and Pageantry; If instead of preserving Order and Peace, he fomenteth Discords and Factions in the Church; being a Make-bate and Incendiary among Christians; If he claimeth exorbitant Power, and exerciseth Oppression and tyrannical Domination over his Brethren; cursing and damning all that will not submit

*Non Facit Ecclesiastica dignitas Christianum. Hier.*  
Ecclesiastical dignity makes not a Christian.

*Non omnes Episcopi Episcopi sunt. Id.*  
All Bishops are not Bishops.  
*Oi παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκτάκτοι, ὡς ἐπὶ ἐπισκοπῇ. Athan. Const. Ap. 8. 2.*  
They with them are scouts or spies, not Overseers or Bishops.

to his Dictates and commands; If instead of being a Shepherd, he is a Wolf, worrying and tearing the Flock by cruel Persecution: He by such behaviour *ipso facto* depriveth himself of Authority and Office; He becometh thence no Guide or Pastour to any Christian; there doth in such case rest no obligation to hear or obey him; but rather to decline him, to discontinue from him, to reject and disclaim him.

This is the reason of the case, this the Holy Scripture doth prescribe, this is according to the Primitive Doctrine, Tradition and Practice of the Church. For,

10. In reason, the nature of any spiritual Office consisting in Instruction in Truth and Guidance in Vertue toward attainment of Salvation; if any man doth lead into pernicious Errour or Impiety, he thereby ceaseth to be capable of such Office: As a blind man, by

*Luk. 6. 39. Μὴν δύναιαι περὶς τυφλὸν ὁδῶν εἶναι;*

*Matt. 15. 14.*

*Ezek. 3. 18.*

*Matt. 15. 9.*

*faith in such a case,*

*αὐτοὺς εἰσονται με,*

*In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Precepts of men*

*They themselves do acknowledge that Hereticks cease to be bishops;*

*and so to be Popes. Indeed they cease to be Christians; for*

*ὁ ποιῶν, such a one is subverted.*

*11. According to their Principles, the Pope hath the same relation*

*to other Bishops and Pastours of the Church, which they have to their*

*people; he being Pastour of Pastours: But if any Pastour should teach*

*bad Doctrine, or prescribe bad Practice, his people may reject and*

*disobey him; therefore in proportion, the Pastours may desert the*

*Pope misguiding or misgoverning them. In such cases any Inferiour*

*is exempted from obligation to comply with his Superiour, either truly or pretendedly such.*

*12. The case may be that we may not hold communion with the*

*Pope, but may be obliged to shun him; in which case his Authority*

*doth fail, and no man is subject to him.*

*13. This is the Doctrine of the Scripture. The High Priest and his*

*fellows, under the Jewish Oeconomy, had no less Authority than any*

*Pope can now pretend unto; they did sit in the Chair of Moses, and*

*therefore all their True Doctrines and Lawfull Directions the people*

*were*

more he, that declareth a will to seduce; for, *Who so blind as he that will not see?*

No man can be bound to follow any one into the ditch: or to obey any

one in prejudice to his own Salvation; to die in his iniquity. Seeing God

saith in such a case, *αὐτοὺς εἰσονται με, In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Precepts of men*

They themselves do acknowledge that Hereticks cease to be bishops;

and so to be Popes. Indeed they cease to be Christians; for

ὁ ποιῶν, such a one is subverted.

11. According to their Principles, the Pope hath the same relation

to other Bishops and Pastours of the Church, which they have to their

people; he being Pastour of Pastours: But if any Pastour should teach

bad Doctrine, or prescribe bad Practice, his people may reject and

disobey him; therefore in proportion, the Pastours may desert the

Pope misguiding or misgoverning them. In such cases any Inferiour

is exempted from obligation to comply with his Superiour, either truly or pretendedly such.

12. The case may be that we may not hold communion with the

Pope, but may be obliged to shun him; in which case his Authority

doth fail, and no man is subject to him.

13. This is the Doctrine of the Scripture. The High Priest and his

fellows, under the Jewish Oeconomy, had no less Authority than any

Pope can now pretend unto; they did sit in the Chair of Moses, and

therefore all their True Doctrines and Lawfull Directions the people

were

were obliged to learn and observe; but their false Doctrines, and impious Precepts they were bound to shun; and consequently to disclaim their Authority so far as employ'd in urging such Doctrines and Precepts; *Ἀφίτη αὐτοίς, Let them alone, saith our Saviour, they are blind leaders of the blind.* Under the Christian dispensation, the matter is no less clear; our Lord commandeth us to beware of false Prophets; and to see that no man deceive us; although he wear the cloathing of a Sheep, or come under the name of a Shepherd (coming in his name—). Saint Paul informeth us, that if an Apostle, if an Angel from Heaven doth preach beside the old Apostolical Doctrine (introducing any new Gospel, or a Divinity devised by himself) he is to be held accursed by us. He affirmeth, that even the Apostles themselves were not Lords of our faith, nor might challenge any power inconsistent with the maintenance of Christian Truth and Piety; *We* (saith he) *can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth;* the which an ancient Writer doth well apply to the Pope, saying, that he could do nothing against the truth more than any of his Fellow-priests could do; which St Paul did in practice shew, when he resisted Saint Peter, declining from the truth of the Gospel. He chargeth that if any one doth *ἐπιδιδασκαλεῖν*, teach heterodoxies, we should stand off from him; that, if any brother walketh disorderly, and not according to Apostolical tradition, we should withdraw from him; that if any one doth raise divisions and scandals beside the doctrines received from the Apostles we should decline from him; that we are to refuse any heretical person. He telleth us that grievous Wolves should come into the Church, not sparing the flock; that from among Christians there should arise men speaking perverse things, to draw disciples after them; but no man surely ought to follow, but to shun them.

These Precepts and Admonitions are general, without any respect or exception of Persons great or small, Pastour or Lay-men: nay they may in some respect more concern Bishops than others; for that they declining from truth, are more dangerous and and contagious.

14. The Fathers (in reference to this case) do clearly accord, both in their Doctrine and Practice. St Cyprian telleth us, that a people obedient to the Lord's commandments, and fearing God, ought to separate it self from a sinful Bishop, that is, from one guilty of such sins which unqualifie him for Christian Communion or Pastoral charge; and Let not (addeth he) the common people flatter it self, as if it could be free from the contagion of guilt, if it communicate with a sinful Bishop; whose irreligious Doctrine or Practice doth render him incapable of communion; for how (saith he otherwhere) can they preside over integrity and continence, if corruptions and the teaching of vices do begin to proceed from them?

They who reject the Commandment of God, and labour to establish their own tradition, let them be strongly and stoutly refused and rejected by you.

L 1

Matt. 16. 6. *Ὁρᾶτε καὶ μὴ σκελεῖτε τὰς λέξεις τῶν ἄνθρώπων*—*Verf. 12.*  
Beware and take heed of the leaven—  
of the doctrine.

Matt. 15. 14.

Matt. 7. 15.

Matt. 24. 4.

Gal. 1. 8, 9.

2 Cor. 1. 24.

2 Cor. 13. 7, 8.

*Nec aliquid contra veritatem, sed pro veritate, plus suis Con-sacerdotibus potest.*  
Fac. Hermian. 2. 6.

Gal. 2. 11. 14. *Ὅτι ἐκ ἐξουσιῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλλοθεν τὰ εὐαγγέλια.*

1 Tim. 6. 3, 5. *ἢ τις ἐπιδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ ἀρῖσται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλείονος.*

2 Thess. 3. 6. *ἐλλοιδίαν ἀπὸ πάντων ἀδελφῶν.*

Rom. 16. 17. *ἐκκλίθεν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ.*

Tit. 3. 10.

A.R. 20. 29. *ἐκκλησίου εἰς ὑμᾶς.*

A.R. 20. 30.

*Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis & Deum metuens à peccatore præposito separare se debet.* Cyp. Ep. 68.

*Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse à contagio delicti possit cum Sacerdote peccatore communicans.* Ibid.

sinful Bishop; whose

*Quomodo enim possunt integritati & continentie præesse, si ex ipsis incipiunt corruptela & vitiorum magisteria procedere?* Cyp. Ep. 62.

*Qui mandatum Dei rejiciunt, & traditionem suam statuere conantur, fortiter à vobis & firmiter respuantur.* Cyp. Ep. 40. (p. 73.)

St.



Ἄλλα δεῖται ἐκδομῶν, ὅτι ἀξίωμα  
 πρεσβυτέρων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων, ὅταν πρεσβυτέρων  
 δεῖται ὁ λόγος ἡ. Chryf. in Gal. 1. 9.  
 Καὶ ὅτι πρεσβυτέρων Ἀγγέλων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων  
 ἐξ ἑαυτῶν, διαδοθέντων τὸ κήρυγμα.  
 ἀνάστημα ἔστω. Ibid. 1. 8.  
 Καὶ καὶ ἑπὶ, ἵαν ἐναντία καὶ ἀλλή-  
 λωσιν, ἢ ἀναλίσκωσι τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 μικρὸν ἢ ἀναλίσκωσι τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ  
 χαλκισμῶν, καὶ τὴν τὴν ἐκκαθάρσιν  
 ἀνάστημα ἔστωσαν. Ibid.

And other-where, very earnestly persuading his Audience to render due respect and obedience to their Bishop, he yet interposeth this

Εἰ μὲν γὰρ δόγμα ἔχει διασεμνόνον,  
 καὶ Ἀγγέλων ἢ, καὶ πῶς εἰ ὁ ὅρθε  
 διδάσκει, καὶ τὴν βίαν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ  
 τὴν βίαν. Chryf. in 2. Tim. Orat. 2.  
 Ecclesiastici Judices ut homines ple-  
 runque falluntur—Aug. c. Cresc. 2. 21.  
 Quia nec Catholicis Episcopis consenti-  
 endum est, sicuti forte falluntur, ut con-  
 tra Canonicas Dei Scripturas aliquid sen-  
 tiant. August. de Univ. Eccl. cap. 10.

Si quis est Ecclesia, quæ fidem respuat,  
 nec Apostolica prædicationis fundamenta  
 possideat, ne quam labem perfidie possit  
 aspergere deferenda est. Ambr. in Luc. 9.  
 (p. 85.)

If in such case we must desert any Church, then the Roman; if any Church, then much more any Bishop, particularly him of Rome.

Quod non solum præfati Apostolico face-  
 re licet, sed cuicumque Pontifici, ut quos-  
 libet & quemlibet locum secundum regu-  
 lam hæreses ipsius ante damnata, à Ca-  
 tholica communione discernant. P. Ge-  
 las. I. Ep. 4.

Fides universalis est, omnium commu-  
 nis est, non solum ad Clericos, verum etiam  
 ad Laicos, & ad omnes omnino pertinet  
 Christianos. P. Nich. I. Ep. 8. p. 506.

Oves ergo quæ pastori suo commissa fue-  
 rint, cum nec reprehendere, nisi à recta  
 fide exorbitaveris, debent—P. Joh. I.  
 Ep. 1. (apud Bin. Tom. 3. p. 812.)

15. That this was the current opinion, common practice doth shew, there being so many instances of those who rejected their Superiours, and withdrew from their communion, in case of their maintaining errors, or of their disorderly behaviour; such practice having been approved by General and Great Synods as also by divers Popes.

Ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ πολλὰς πλὴν τῶν ἐκ-  
 λαβέντων πρεσβυτέρων ἤλεγξαν αὐτοὺς,  
 καὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς πᾶσι τὴν αὐτὴν κοινότητα  
 αὐτοὺς ἐξέβαλον—Conc. Eph. part I.  
 p. 220.

Εὐχὰ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνόδου  
 ἐκ τῆς συνόδου ἀδελφῶν πνευματικῶν κα-  
 λιστα πᾶσι καὶ διδασκαλῶν ἀπονέμειν  
 εἰ δὲ αὐτοὺς τὸν διδασκῶν ἐν ὁρίῳ αὐ-  
 τῶν τῶν ὑπακούειν ἐν τῇ πνεύματι τῇ πνεύματι

St. Chrysostome, commenting on Saint Paul's words, *If I or an Angel*—saith, that Saint Paul meaneth to shew, that dignity of persons is not to be regarded where truth is concerned; that, if one of the chief Angels from Heaven should corrupt the Gospel, he were to be accursed; that, not only if they shall speak things contrary, or overturn all, but if they preach any small matter beside the Apostolical doctrine, altering the least point whatever, they are liable to an anathema.

And other-where, very earnestly persuading his Audience to render due respect and obedience to their Bishop, he yet interposeth this exception, *If he hath a perverse opinion, although he be an Angel do not obey him; but if he teacheth right things, regard not his life but his words.*

*Ecclesiastical Judges as men are for the most part deceived;*

*For neither are Catholick Bishops to be assented to, if peradventure in any case they are mistaken, so as to hold any thing contrary to the canonical Scriptures of God.*

*If there be any Church which rejects the faith, and does not hold the fundamentals of the Apostolical doctrine, it ought to be forsaken, lest it infect others with its heterodoxy.*

If in such case we must desert any Church, then the Roman; if any Church, then much more any Bishop, particularly him of Rome.

This hath been the Doctrine of divers Popes.

*Which not only the Apostolical Prelate, but any other Bishop may doe, viz. discriminate and sever any men, and any place from the Catholick communion, according to the rule of that fore-condemned heresie.*

*Faith is universal, common to all, and belongs not only to Clergymen but also to Laicks, and even to all Christians.*

*Therefore the sheep which are committed to the cure of their Pastour, ought not to reprehend him, unless he swerve and go astray from the right faith.*

When Nestorius Bishop of Constantinople did introduce new and strange Doctrine, divers of his Presbyters did rebuke him, and withdraw communion from him; which proceeding is approved in the Ephesine Synod.

Particularly Charisus did assert this proceeding in those remarkable words presented to that same Synod; *'Tis the wish and desire of all well affected persons, to give always all due honour and reverence especially to their Spiritual Fathers and Teachers: but if it should so happen*

happent that they who ought to teach, should instil unto those who are set under them such things concerning the faith, as are offensive to the ears and hearts of all men, then of necessity the order must be inverted, and they who teach wrong Doctrine must be rebuked of their seniors.

Pope Celestine I. in that case did commend the people of *Constantinople*, deserting their Pastour; *Happy flock* (said he) *to whom the Lord did afford to iudge about its own Pasture.*

σεως, οἷα τὰς ἀπάντων αἰσῶς καὶ καρδίας  
 καθάλασσε, ἀνέγνω τὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων  
 ἀπόκρισιν καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς διδάσκει ἐλπί-  
 νος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡρώδου διελογησάτω· Cha-  
 rif. in Conc. Eph. Act. 6. p. 328.

Μαχαίῃ· ἢ ὑμᾶς ἢ ἀγέλην ἢ περίεαν  
ὁ Κύριος· κρίνεν περὶ τῆς ἰδίᾳς νομῆς. Co-  
lest. I. in Cons. Eph. p. 190.

St. *Hierome* did presume to write very briskly and smartly in reproof of *John* Bishop of *Hierusalem*, in whose province he a simple Presbyter did reside.

*Who makes a Schism in the Church? we whose whole house in Bethlehem communicates with the Church, or thou, who either believest aright, and proudly concealest the truth, or art of a wrong belief, and really makest a breach in the Church? Art thou onely the Church? and is he who offendeth thee excluded from Christ?*

*Quis scindit  
Ecclesiam?  
nos quorum  
omnis domus  
in Bethleem  
in Ecclesia  
communicat :*

an tu qui aut bene credis, & superbè de fide tacet, aut malè & vrrè scindis Ecclesiam? — An tu solus Ecclesia es; & qui se offenderis à Christo excluditur? Hier. Ep. 61. cap. 16. Ep. 62.

*Malchion, Presbyter of Antioch* disputed against *Paulus Samosatenus* his Bishop.

Malchion di-  
sertissimus  
Antiochens

*Ecclēsia Presbyter, adversus Paulum Samosatenum, qui Antiochēna Ecclēsia Episcopus dogma Artemonii inaurarat dispu-*  
*savit. Hieron. in Catal.*

*Beatus* Presbyter confuted his Bishop *Elipandus* of Toledo.

But if the Rectour swerve from the faith, he is to be reprov'd by those who are under him,

Quod si à fide  
exorbitaverit  
Rector, tunc

*arguendus erit à subditis* *Idid. Hisp. de Offic. 3. 39. Vid. Thomam Aq. in 4. Dist. 19. Art. 2.*

16. The case is the same of the Pope; for if other Bishops, who are reckoned Successors of the Apostles, and Vicars of Christ within their precinct; if other Patriarchs, who sit in Apostolical Sees, and partake of a like extensive Jurisdiction, by incurring heresie or schism, or committing notorious disorder and injustice, may be deprived of their Authority, so that their Subjects may be obliged to forsake them, then may the Pope lose his: for truth and piety are not affixed to the Chair of *Rome* more than to any other; there is no ground of asserting any such Privilege either in Holy Scripture or in old Tradition; there can no promise be alledged for it, having any probable shew (that of *Oravi pro te*, being a ridiculous pretence) it cannot stand without a perpetual miracle; there is in fact no appearance of any such miracle; from the ordinary causes of great error and impiety (that is, ambition, avarice, sloth, luxury) the Papal state is not exempt, yea apparently it is more subject to them than any other; All Ages have testified and complained thereof.

17. Most eminent persons have in such cases withdrawn communion from the Pope; as other-where we have shewed by divers Instances.

18. The Canon Law it self doth admit the Pope may be judged if he be a Heretick. — *Because he that is to judge all persons is to be judged of none, except he be found to be gone astray from the faith.*

*Quia cunctos  
ipse iudicatu-  
rus à nemine  
est Baron.—*

est judicandus, nisi deprehendatur à fide devius. Gra. dist. 40. cap. 6. Vid. P. Innoc. III. apud Laun. con. 73. Baron. —

The supposition doth imply the possibility, and therefore the case may be put that he is such, and then he doth (according to the more current Doctrine ancient and modern) cease to be a Bishop, yea a Christian; Hence no obedience is due to him; yea no communion is to be held with him.

19. This in fact was acknowledged by a great Pope, allowing the condemnation of Pope *Honorius* for good, because he was erroneous

Καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐν τῇ Ἀνα-  
τακτικῇ καὶ διὰ τὸν ἀντιστοιχισμὸν ἐπὶ τῇ, ὁ-  
μοίαν γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ἐστὶν αἰσθητικὴ κατὰ τὴν  
ἐξουσίαν. δι' ἣν καὶ μόνον ἐξέρχεται τὸ ὄνομα τῆς  
ἐξουσίας καὶ μὴ τῆς ἐξουσίας. Syn. VIII.  
At. γ. p. 963.

in point of Faith: for (saith he, in that which is called the Eighth Synod) although Honorius was anathematized after his death by the Oriental Bishops, it is yet well known, that he was accused for heresie; for which alone it is lawfull for inferiours to rise up against superiours.

Now that the Pope (or Papal succession) doth pervert the truth of Christian Doctrine, in contradiction to the Holy Scripture, and Primitive Tradition; that he doth subvert the practice of Christian piety in opposition to the Divine commands; that he teacheth falsehoods, and maintaineth impieties, is notorious in many particulars, some whereof we shall touch.

We justly might charge him with all those extravagant Doctrines and Practices which the high-flying Doctours do teach, and which the fierce Zealots upon occasion do act; for the whole succession of Popes of a long time hath most cherished and encouraged such folks, looking squintly on others, as not well affected to them; But we shall onely touch those new and noxious or dangerous positions, which great Synods, managed and confirmed by their Authority, have defined, or which they themselves have magisterially decreed; or which are generally practised by their influence or countenance.

It is manifest, that the Pope doth support and cherish as his special Favourites the Vendors of wicked Errours; such as those who teach the Pope's *infallibility*, his *power over temporal Princes*, to cashier and depose them, to *absolve Subjects from their allegiance*—the Doctrine of *equivocation*, *breach of faith with hereticks*, &c. the which Doctrines are heretical, as inducing pernicious practice; whence whoever doth so much as communicate with the maintainers of them, according to the principles of ancient Christianity, are guilty of the same crimes.

Matt. 4. 10. Apoc. 19. 10. 22. 9. Col.  
2. 18. Rom. 1. 25.

κρίσμα γὰρ ὧν ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἐξοικνί τ' ὁμοιογ  
 ἐξερχομεν. Baf. apud Sozom. 6. 16.

The Holy Scripture and Catholick Antiquity do teach and enjoin us to *worship and serve God alone*, our Creatour; forbidding us to worship any Creature, or *Fellow-Servant*; even not Angels. *For I who am a Creature will not endure to worship one like to me.*

Similiter &  
Sanctos una  
eum Christo  
regnantes ve-

nerandos atque invocandos esse:— atque horum reliquias esse venerandas. Pii IV. Profess. fid. Bonum atque utile esse eos invocare— Sanctorum quoque corpora— à fidelibus veneranda esse Conc. Trid.

But the Pope and his Clients do teach and charge us to worship Angels, and dead men; yea even to venerate *the reliques and dead bodies of the Saints.*

The Holy Scripture teacheth us to judge nothing (about the the present or future state of men, absolutely) before the time, untill the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of hearts, and then each man shall have praise of God.

But the Pope notoriously (in repugnance to those precepts, anticipating God's Judgment, and arrogating to himself a knowledge requisite



quifite thereto) doth presume to determine the state of men, cano-  
nizing them, declaring them to be Saints, and propofing them to be  
worshipped; and on the other fide, he damneth, curfeth and cenfu-  
reth his Fellow-Servants.

God in his Law doth command us not to bow  
down our felves unto any image, or worship the like-  
nefs of any thing in heaven, or earth, or under the  
earth; the which Law (whether Moral or Pofi-  
tive) the Gospel doth ratifie and confirm, charging us to keep our felves  
from idols, and to fly worshipping of idols, that is, to obferve the Second  
Commandment; the validity whereof the Fathers moft exprefly  
affert; and divers of them were fo ftrict in their opinion about it, Clem. Alex.  
Tertul.

But the Pope and his adherents (in point-blank oppofition to Divine  
Law, and Primitive Doctrine) doth require us to  
fall down before and to worship Images. Moreover  
we decree that the Images of Saints be efpecially had  
and retain'd in Churches, and that due honour and  
veneration be imparted to them—fo that by thofe  
Images which we kifs, and before which we uncover  
the head and fall down, we adore Chrift, and vene-  
rate the Saints whose likenefs they bear.

Neither is he fatisfied to recommend and decree thefe unwarrantable  
venerations, but (with a horrible ftrange kind of uncharitablenefs and  
ferity) doth he anathematize thofe, who teach or  
think any thing oppofite to his decrees concerning  
them; fo that if the ancient Fathers should live  
now, they would live under this curfe.

The Holy Scripture, under condition of Repentance and amendment  
of life, upon recourfe to God and truft in his mercy, through Jefus  
Chrift our Saviour, doth offer and promife Remiffion of fins, Accep-  
tance with God, Juftification and Salvation; this is the tenour of the  
Evangelical Covenant; nor did the Primitive Church know other terms.

But the Pope both preach another Doctrine, and requireth other  
terms as neceffary for Remiffion of Sins and Salvation; for he hath de-  
creed the confeffion of all and each mortal fin, which a man by recol-  
lection can remember, to a Priest, to be neceffary thereto; anathema-  
tizing all who fhall fay the contrary; although the Fathers (par-  
ticularly St. Chryfoftome frequently) have affirmed the contrary.

*missionem peccatorum neceffarium non effe jure divino confiteri omnia & fingula peccata mortalia, quorum memo-  
ria cum debita & diligenti premeditatione habeatur—anathema fit. Sess. 14. de Pen. Can. 7.*

If any one fhall fay, that in the Sacrament of Penance, it is not neceffary by divine right to confeff  
all and fingular mortal fins, the remembrance whereof may be had by due and diligent premeditati-  
on let him be anathema.

The which is plainly preaching another Gospel (forged by himfelf and  
his abettors) as offering Remiffion upon other terms than God hath  
prefcribed; and denying it upon thofe which Christianity propofeth.

He teacheth that no fin is pardoned without abfolution of a Priest.

He requireth fatisfaction impofed by a Priest, befides repentance  
and new obedience, as neceffary. Which is alfo another Gospel.

*gram & perfectam peccatorum remiffionem requiri—contritionem, confeffionem & fatisfactionem. Sess. 14. Can. 4.*  
If any fhall deny that contrition, confeffion and fatisfaction, is required to the entire and perfe  
remiffion of fin.

He

Exod. 20. 4. & non facies tibi idola  
laur, & idola non facies.

1 Joh. 5. 21.  
1 Cor. 10. 14, 7.

*Imagines porro—Sanctorum in Tem-  
plis prefertim habendas, & retinendas,  
eisque debitum honorem & venerationem  
impartendam—itā ut per Imagines,  
quas osculamur & coram quibus caput  
aperimus, & procumbimus, Christum ado-  
remus, & Sanctos quarum illa fimilitu-  
dinem gerunt, veneremur. Conc. Trid.  
Sess. 25.*

*Siquis autem his decretis contraria de-  
cuerit, aut fenerit, anathema fit. Conc.  
Trid. Sess. 25.*

Ezek. 18.  
Luk. 15.  
Rom. 10. 9.  
Mark. 1. 15.

*Si quis dixe-  
rit in Sacra-  
mento peni-  
tentie ad re-*

*Si quis nega-  
verit ad inte-*

Et qui Hierosolymam proficiuntur. & ad Christianam gentem defendendam, & tyrannidem infidelium debellandum efficaciter auxilium præbuerint, quorum peccatorum remissionem concedimus — Conc. Lat. I. Can. 11.

And whoever go to Jerusalem and powerfully afford help to defend Christian people, and to subdue the tyranny of Infidels, to them we grant forgiveness of their sins —

He dispenseth pardon of sin upon condition of performances unnecessary and insufficient; such as undertaking *Pilgrimages to the Shrines of Saints, Visiting Churches, making War upon Infidels or Hereticks, Contributing Money, repeating Prayers, undergoing Corporal Penances, &c.* Which is likewise to frame and publish another Gospel.

These Doctrines are highly presumptuous, and well may be reputed heretical.

Rom. 13. 1.—  
Tit. 3. 1.—  
1 Pet.—  
ἐν ἀποκ.—  
ἀφ.—  
Chrys.—  
Si omnis & vestra —

— si quis tentat excipere, conatur decipere. Bern. Ep. 42.

God hath commanded that every soul should be subject to the higher powers temporal, as to God's Ministers; so as to obey their Laws, to submit to their Judgments, to pay Tribute to them—And the Fathers expound this Law to the utmost extent and advantage. *If every soul, then yours, if any attempt to except you, he goes about to deceive you.*

Lex Canonica simpliciter eos eximit. Bell. de Cler. cap. 1. Sanè quia Laici quidam Ecclesiasticas personas & ipsos etiam Episcopos suo iudicio stare compellunt, eos qui de cætero id præsumpserint, à communione fidelium decernimus segregandos. Conc. Lat. III. Can. 14. Con. Lat. II. Can. 15. Steph. VI. Ep. 1. (Tom. 1. p. 130.) Nichol. I. Ep. 8. (T.m. 6. p. 513.)

But the Pope countermandeth, and exempteth all Clergy-men from those duties, by his *Canon Law*; excommunicating Lay-Judges, who shall perform their office in regard to them. *Because indeed some Lay-persons constrain Ecclesiasticks, yea and Bishops themselves, to appear before them and to stand to their judgment, those that henceforth shall presume to do so, we decree that they shall be separate from the communion of the faithful.*

Tertul. Opt. Cyril. &c. alibi. Greg. Ep. 2. 62. Agatho, &c.

2 Theff. 2. 4.

Christus beato æterna vita Clavigero terreni simul & celestis Imperii jura commisit. P. Nich. II. apud Grat, dist. 22. cap. 1. Greg. VII Ep. 8. 21. Caus. 15. qu. 6. cap. 3.

The Scriptures do represent the King (or Temporal Sovereign) as Supreme over his Subjects, to whom all are obliged to yield special respect and obedience: The Fathers yield him the same place, above all next to God; and subject to God alone: The ancient good Popes did acknowledge themselves Servants, and Subjects to the Emperour.

But later Popes, like the man of sin in Saint Paul, have advanced themselves above all Civil power; claiming to themselves a supereminency not onely of Rank but of power over all Christian Princes; even to depose them. *Christ has committed the rights both of terrestrial and celestial government to that blessed man who bears the keys of eternal life.*

Seculi potestates si fideles sunt, Deus Ecclesia Sacerdotibus unus esse subiectus — Imperatores Christiani subdere debent executiones suas Ecclesiasticis præsulibus, non præferre. P. Joh. VIII. apud Grat. dist. 96. cap. 11.

*If the secular power be believers, God would have them subject to the Priests of the Church—Christian Emperours ought to submit, and not prefer the execution of their Laws to the Rulers of the Church.*

God by indispenfable Law hath obliged us to retain our obedience to the King even Pagan; charging us under pain of damnation to be subject to him, and not to resist him—

But the Pope is ready upon occasion to discharge Subjects from that obligation, to absolve them from their solemn Oaths of Allegiance, to

to encourage Insurrection against him; to prohibit obedience—We observing the Decrees of our holy Predecessors, by our Apostolical Authority absolve those from their Oath who were bound by their Fealty and Oath to excommunicated Persons: and we forbid them by all means that they yield them no Allegiance, till they come and make satisfaction.

Nos sanctarum  
Predecesso-  
rum nostror-  
um Statuta  
tenentes, eos  
qui excommu-  
nicatis Fide-  
li-

tate aut Sacramento confecti sunt, Apostolica auctoritate à Sacramento absolvimus, & ne eis Fidelitatem observent omnibus modis prohibemus, quousque ipsi ad satisfactionem veniant. Greg. VII. in Syn. Rom. Grat. Caus. 15. qu. 6. cap. 4.

Thus doth he teach and prescribe Rebellion, Perjury—together with all the Murthers and Rapines consequent on them: which is a far greater Heresie, than if he should teach Adultery, Murther or Theft to be lawfull. For they are enjoined by no authority to perform the Allegiance which they have sworn to a Christian Prince, who is an adversary to God and his Saints, and contemns their commands.

Fidelitatem  
enim quam  
Christiano  
Principi ju-

rant, Deo ejusque Sanctis adversanti, eorum precepta calcanti, nulla cohibentur auctoritate persolvere—  
P. Urb. II. apud Grat. Caus. 15. qu. 6. cap. 5.

Not onely the Holy Scripture, but Common Sense doth shew it to be an enormous presumption to obtrude for the Inspirations, Oracles and Dictates of God, any Writings or Propositions, which are not really such.

Ezek. 13. 3,  
&c.

This the Pope doeth notoriously, charging us to admit divers writings, (which the greatest part of learned men in all Ages have refused for such) as Sacred and Canonical; anathematizing all those who do not hold each of them for such—Even as they are extant in a Translation, not very exact, and framed partly out of Hebrew, partly out of Greek, upon divers accounts liable to mistake; as its Author St. Hierome doth avow.

Si quis autem  
libros ipsos in-  
tegras cum  
suis patribus,  
prout in Ec-  
clesia Catholi-  
ca legi consue-  
verunt, & in  
veteri vulgata

Latina Editione habentur, pro Sacris & Canonicis non susceperit— anathema sit. Conc. Trid. Sess. 4.  
But if any shall not receive for Sacred and Canonical, those whole Books with the parts of them, according as they have been wont to be read in the Catholick Church, and are had in the old vulgar Latin Edition; let him be Anathema.

According to which Decree, all who consent with St. Hierome, St. Austin, St. Athanasius, &c. with common sense, with the Author of the Second of Maccabees himself, must incur a curse—what can be more uncharitable, more unjust, more silly than such a Definition?

He pretendeth to Infallibility, or encourageth them who attribute it to him; which is a continual Enthusiasm and profane bold Imposture.

The Scripture doth avow a singular reverence due to it self, as containing the Oracles of God.—

But the Pope doth obtrude the Oral Traditions of his Church (divers of which evidently are new, dubious, vain—) to be worshipped with equal reverence as the Holy Scripture. And also receives and venerates with the like pious respect and reverence the Traditions themselves— which have been preserved by continual succession in the Catholick Church.

— nec non  
traditiones  
ipsas— con-  
tinua succe-  
ssione in Ecclē-  
sia Catholica

conservatas pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit, & veneratur. Syn. Trid. Sess. 4.

Among which Traditions they reckon all the tricks and trumpery of their Mass-service; together with all their new notions about  
Pur-



*Ceremonias* Purgatory, Extreme unction, &c. He also used several ceremonies, as *mytical benediction, lights, incensings, garments, and many other such* ut *mytical be- things, from Apostolical discipline, and tradition.* *meditationes* lumina, thymiamata, vestes, aliæque id genus multa ex Apostolica disciplina & traditione— Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. cap. 5. 11. de sacrif. Missæ.

The Scriptures affirm themselves to be written for common instruction, comfort, edification in all piety; they do therefore recommend themselves to be studied and searched by all people; as the best and surest means of attaining knowledge and finding truth. The Fathers also do much exhort all people, (even women and girls) constantly to read; and diligently to study the Scriptures.

But the Pope doth keep them from the people, locked up in Languages not understood by them; prohibiting Translations of them to be made, or used — The Scripture teacheth, and common sense sheweth, and the Fathers do assert (nothing indeed more frequently or more plainly) that all necessary points of faith and good morality are with sufficient evidence cou-

1 Tim. 3. 15. — Rom. 15. 4. 1 Cor. 9. 10. 10. 11. 2 Pet. 1. 20. *Scripturæ.*  
Joh. 5. 39. Act. 17. 11.  
Psal. 119. —  
Hier. ad Læt. Epistaph. Paul. Vit. Hilar. —  
Chryl. in Colof. Or. 9.  
Aug. Serm. 55. de temp.

N. P. Pius IV. did authorize certain rules for prohibition and permission of books; in which it is permitted to Bishops to grant a faculty of reading the Scriptures translated — but to this rule there is added an observation, that *this power was taken from Bishops by command of the Roman Universal Inquisition. Ind. Lib. prohib. à Clem. VIII.*

ched in Holy Scripture, so that a man of God, or pious men may thence be perfectly furnished to every work; But they contrary-wise blaspheme the Scriptures as obscure, dangerous, &c.

Common sense dictareth, that devotions should be performed with understanding and affection; and that consequently they should be in a known tongue: And Saint Paul expressly teacheth,

1 Cor. 14. 14. — *Ex hac Pauli doctrina habetur, quid melius est ad Ecclesie edificationem in orationibus publicis, quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici lingua communi Clericis & populo, quàm dici Latine* Cajet. in 1 Cor. 14.

that it is requisite for private and publick edification; from this Doctrine of Paul it appears, that it is better for the edification of the Church, that publick prayers, which are said in the audience of the people, should be said in a tongue common to the Clergy and the people, than that they should be said in Latin.

All ancient Churches did accordingly practise; and most others do so, beside those which the Pope doth ride.

But the Pope will not have it so, requiring the publick Liturgy to be celebrated in an unknown tongue; and that most Christians shall say their devotions like Parrots. He anathematizeth those, who think the Mass should be celebrated in a vulgar tongue; that is all those who are in their right wits, and think it fit to follow the practice of the ancient Church.

—aut Lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere — anathema sit. Sess. 22. Chm. 9.

The Holy Scripture teacheth us that there is but one Head of the Church; and the Fathers do avow no other (as we have elsewhere shewed.)

A quo tanquam Capite omnis in subiecta membra potestas & auctoritas derivetur. P. Pius II. in Bull. Rstract.

Definimus Romanum Pontificem — verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesie caput — Defin. Syn. Flor.

But the Pope assumeth to himself the headship of the Church, affirming all power and authority to be derived from him into the subject members of the Church.

We decree that the Roman Pontife is the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church.

The

The Scripture declareth that God did institute marriage for remedy of incontinency and prevention of sin; forbidding the use of it to none, who should think it needful or convenient for them; reckoning the prohibition of it among heretical doctrines; implying it to be *imposing a snare* upon men.

But the Pope and his Complices do prohibit it to whole Orders of men, (*Priests, &c.*) engaging them into dangerous vows.

Our Lord forbiddeth any marriage lawfully contracted to be dissolved, otherwise than in case of adultery.

But the Pope commandeth Priests married to be divorced. *And that marriages contracted by such persons should be dissolved.*

He dissolveth matrimony agreed, by the profession of monkery of one of the espoused. *If any shall say, that matrimony confirmed, not consummate, is not dissolved by the solemn profession of religion of either party, let him be anathema.*

Our Saviour did institute and enjoin us (under pain of damnation, if we should wilfully transgress his order) to eat of his body, and drink of his blood, in participation of the Holy Supper.

The Fathers did accordingly practise, with the whole Church, till late times.

But notwithstanding Christ's institution (as they express it) Papal Synods do prohibit all Laymen, and Priests not celebrating to partake of Christ's blood; so maiming and perverting our Lord's Institution: † *and yet they decline to drink the blood of our redemption.*

In defence of which practice, they confound body and blood; and under a curse would oblige us to believe, that one kind doth contain the other; or that a part doth contain the whole.

Whereas our Lord saith, that *who so eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood hath eternal life*, and consequently supposeth, that bad men do not partake of his body and blood; yet they condemn this assertion under a curse.

The Holy Scripture, and the Fathers after it, commonly do call the elements of the Eucharist, after consecration, bread and wine; affirming them to retain their nature.

But the Popish Cabal anathematizeth those who say, that bread and wine do then remain.

*If any shall say that in the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remain* —let him be Anathema.

The nature of the Lord's Supper doth imply communion and company; but they forbid any man to say that a Priest may not communicate alone; so establishing the belief of non-sense, and contradiction.

M m

Matt. 19. 11.

Μὴ ἐκ ἑχομένου ἐξ ὧν 3 — 1 Cor. 9. 5.

Κωλύοντες γαμίσιν 1 Tim. 4. 3.

Βεβήκειν ὁπὸς ἀλλήλων 1 Cor. 7. 35.

Vid. Tom. 7 Conc. p. 465.

Syn. Trid. Sess. 24. de matr. Can. 9.

Matt. 5. 32, 19. 7. 1. Cor. 7. 10.

Contracta quoque matrimonia ab hujusmodi personis dirigi — Conc. Lat. 1. cap. 21. Lat. 11.

Trid. Sess. 24. Can. 9. —

Si quis dixerit matrimonium ratum, non consummatum, per solennem religionis professionem alterius conjugum non dirimi, anathema sit, Sess. 24. Can. 6.

Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. Matt. 26. 27. ἐάν μὴ — πίνε αὐτὸ τὸ αἷμα, ἐκ ἐξ ὧν ζοῖς. Jon. 6. 53.

Non obstante. Conc. Const. Sess. 13. Conc. Trid. Sess. 13. cap. 8. & Can. 3. Sess. 21. cap. 4. & Can. 3.

† This P. Leo I. condemneth. De Quadr. Sermon. 4. (p. 38.) Sanguinem redemptionis nostra haurire declinant. — P. Gelasius calleth the division of the Sacrament a grand Sacrilege. Gratian. in De Consecr. dist. 2. cap. 12.

Conc. Trid. Sess. 21. Can. 3. Sess. 13. Can. 3.

Joh. 6. 54.

Si quis dixerit tantum in usu, &c. Trid. Conc. Sess. 13. cap. 8. & Can. 4. —

Ἄφρον τῶτον. 1 Cor. 11. 26.

Theod. Gelas. —

Si quis dixerit in Sacrosancto Eucharistia Sacramento remanere substantiam panis & vini — anathema sit. Trid. Conc. de Euch. Sess. 13. Can. 2.

Si quis dixerit Missas in quibus sacerdos solum sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas esse, anathema sit.

Sess. 22. de sac. Miss. Can. 8. Sess. 13. Can. 8.

The

The Holy Scripture teacheth us, that our Lord hath departed, and is absent from us in body; until that he shall come to judge, which is called *his presence*; that heaven, whither he ascended, and where he sitteth at God's right hand, must *hold him till the times of the restitution of all things*.

But the Pope with his *Lateran* and *Tridentine* Complices draw him down from heaven, and make him corporally present every day, in numberless places here.

*Ὁμοιωθεὶς ἡμῖν; πάντα τὰς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν ὁμοιωται.* Heb. 2. 17.

The Scripture teacheth us, that our Lord is a man, *perfectly like to us, in all things*.

But the Pope and his adherents make him extremely different from us, as having a body at once present in innumerable places; insensible, &c. devided of the properties of our body; thereby destroying his humane nature, and in effect agreeing with *Entyches*, *Apollinarius*, and other such pestilent *Hereticks*.

The Scripture representeth him born once for us; but they affirm him every day made by a Priest, uttering the words of consecration; as if that which before did exist, could be made; as if a man could make his Maker.

Heb. 9. 26. 10. 10, 12, 14. *ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἁγιάσῃ.*

The Scripture teacheth, that our Lord was *once offered for expiation of our sins*; but they pretend every day to offer him up as a *propitiatory sacrifice*.

These devices without other foundation, than a figurative expression (which they resolve to expound in a proper sense, although even in that very matter divers figurative expressions are used, as they cannot but acknowledge) they with all violence and fierceness obtrude upon the belief as one of the most necessary and fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.

Eph. 2. 8, 9.  
Tit. 3. 5.  
Rom. 3. 24.  
Luk. 17. 10.

The Scripture teacheth us humbly to acknowledge the rewards assigned by God to be gratuitous and free; and that we, *after we have done all, must acknowledge our selves unprofitable servants*.

But the *Papists* curse those who, although out of humility and modesty, will not acknowledge the good works of justified Persons to be truly meritorious; *deserving the encrease of grace, eternal life, and augmentation of glory*: so forcing us to use saucy words and phrases, if not impious in their sense.

Seff. 6 de Ju-  
rif. Can. 32.

The Scripture teacheth one Church diffused over the whole world; whereof each part is bound to maintain charity, peace and communion with the rest, upon brotherly terms.

*Orbis terrarum Apostatavit, & sola remansit Donati Communio.*

Aug. de Unit.

12. ---  
1 Joh. 4. 1.  
Jer. 29. 8. ---

But the *Romanists* arrogate to themselves the name and privilege of the only Church; condemning all other Churches besides their own, and censuring all for Apostatical who do not adhere to them or submit to their yoke; Just like the *Donatists*, who said that *the world had apostatized*, excepting those who upon their own terms did communicate with them; *only the communion of Donatus remained the true Church*.

The Holy Scripture biddeth us take care of persons pretending to extraordinary Inspirations; charging on the Holy Spirit their own conceits and devices.

Such have been their *Synods*, boldly fathering their Decrees on God's Spirit--- And their Pope is infallible, by virtue of inspiration communicated to him, when he pleaseth to set himself right in his Chair.



Chair. Whence we may take them for bodies of Enthusiasts and Fanaticks: the difference onely is, that other Enthusiasts pretend singly, they conjunctly and by conspiracy. Others pretend it in their own direction and defence, these impose their dreams on the whole Church.

If they say that God hath promised his Spirit to his Church; it is true, but he hath no less plainly and frequently promised it to single Christians, who should seek it earnestly of him.

The Ancient Fathers could in the Scriptures hardly discern more than two Sacraments or Mysterious Rites of our Religion, by positive Law and Institution of our Saviour to be practised.

But the Popes have devised others, and under uncharitable curses propound them to be professed for such, affirming them to confer grace by the bare performance of them.

Every Clergy-man and Monk is bound by Pius IV. to profess *there are just seven of them*; and the Tridentine Synod anathematizeth all those, who do say *there are more or fewer*; although the Ancients did never hit on that number.

But these our Sacraments both contain grace, and also confer it upon those who worthily receive them.

They require men to believe under a curse that each of those were instituted of Christ, and confer grace by the bare performance.

Particularly, they curse those who do not hold *matrimony for a Sacrament, instituted by Christ, and conferring grace*. What can be more ridiculous than to say, that marriage was instituted by Christ, or that it doth confer grace?

Yet with another *anathema* they prefer Virginity before it: and why forsooth is not that another Sacrament? And then they must be comparing the worth of these Sacraments, condemning those heavily, who may conceive them equal, as being Divine Institutions.

If any say that these seven Sacraments are so equal one to another, that one is in no respect of more worth than another, let him be *Anathema*.

The first, as it seemeth, who reckoned the Sacraments to be seven, was Peter Lombard; whom the Schoolmen did follow; and Pope Eugenius IV. followed them; and afterward the Trent men formed it into an Article back'd with an *Anathema*.

Upon which rash and peremptory Sentence touching all ancient Divines, we may note;

1. Is it not strange that an Article of Faith should be formed upon an ambiguous word, or a term of art, used with great variety?

2. Is it not strange to define a Point whereof it is most plain that the Fathers were ignorant, wherein they never did agree or resolve any thing?

3. Yea whereof they speak variously.

4. Is it not odd and extravagant to damn or curse people for a point of so little consideration or certainty?

M m 2

3. Is

Luk. 11. 13.  
Jam. 1. 5.  
1 Joh. 2. 27.  
H. b. 8. 11.  
Rom. 8. 9.  
Act. 5. 32.  
Aug. Doctr.  
Christ. Ep. ad  
Jen.

*Si Sacramenta essent pauciora, magna impietas fuisset, & superstitio, &c.* Bell. de Sac. 2. 25. If the Sacraments were fewer there would have been great impiety and superstition, &c.

*Profiteor quoque septem esse propria & verè Sacramenta.* Bulla Pii IV.

*Si quis dixerit esse plura vel pauciora quàm septem --- anathema sit.* Syn. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 1.

*Hæc verò nostra & continent gratiam, & ipsam dignè susipientibus conferunt.* P. Eug. in Instr. Arm.

*Si quis dixerit per ipsa novæ legis Sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam --- anathema sit.* Ibid. Can. 8.

*Si quis dixerit matrimonium non esse verè ac propriè unum ex septem legis Evangelicæ Sacramentis, à Christo Domino institutum --- neque gratiam conferre, anathema sit.* Sess. 24. Can. 1.

Sess. 24.  
Can. 10.

*Si quis dixerit hæc septem Sacramenta ita esse inter se paria, ut nullâ ratione aliud sit alio dignius, anathema sit.* Sess. 7. Can. 3.

*Novæ legis septem sunt Sacramenta, &c.* P. Eug. in Instr. Arm.

Bellarmino could find none before him. Vid. de Sacram. 2. 25.

5. Is it not intolerable arrogance and presumption to define, nay indeed to make an Article of Faith, without any manner of ground or colour of Authority either from Scripture or Tradition of the ancient Fathers?

*Multa dicuntur à veteribus Sacramenta præter ista scriptum. Bell. de Sacr. 2. 24.*

Many things are by the Ancients called Sacraments besides these seven.

Mat. 23. 8.  
2 Cor. 1. 24.  
1 Thess. 5. 21.  
Col. 2. 8.  
Mat. 15. 9.  
\* Διδάσκαι  
παιδας, &  
ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ  
ἐκείνου.  
Heb. 13. 9.

The Holy Scripture forbiddeth us to call any man master upon earth, or absolutely to subject our Faith to the dictates of any man; it teacheth us that the Apostles themselves are not Lords of our faith, so as to oblige us to believe their own inventions; It forbiddeth us to swallow whole the Doctrines and Precepts of men, without examination of them. It forbiddeth us to admit \* various and strange doctrines.

But the Pope and Roman Church exact from us a submission to their Dictates, admitting them for true, without any farther enquiry or discussion, barely upon his Authority. They who are provided of any Benefices whatever, having cure of Souls, let them promise and swear obedience to the Roman Church,

*Provisi de beneficiis quibuscunque eorum animarum habentibus — in Romana Ecclesia obedientiam spondeant ac jurent. Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. cap. 12. de Ref. — nec non veram obedientiam summo Pontifici spondeant & profiteantur. Sess. 25. cap. 2. de Ref.*

They require of us without doubt to believe, to profess, to assert innumerable Propositions, divers of them new and strange no-wise deducible from Scripture or Apostolical Tradition, the very terms of them being certainly unknown to the Primitive Church, devised by humane subtilty, curiosity, contentiousness — divers of them being (in all appearance, to the judgment of common sense) uncertain, obscure and intricate; divers of them bold and fierce; divers of them frivolous and vain; divers of them palpably false. Namely all such Propositions, as have been taught by their great Juniors, allowed by the Pope, especially that of Trent.

*Cetera item omnia à Sacris Canonibus & Oecumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè à Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, & declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor; simulque contraria omnia, atque hæreses quasque ab Ecclesia damnatas & rejectas & anathematizatas ego pariter damno, repudio & anathematizo. P. Pii IV. professi. Hanc veram Catholicam fidem, extra quam nulla salus est: professi. Ibid.*

Moreover all other things delivered, defined and declared by the Sacred Canons and Oecumenical Councils, and especially by the Holy Synod of Trent, I undoubtedly receive and profess; and also all things contrary therewith, and all heresies whatsoever condemned and rejected, and anathematized by the Church, I in like manner do condemn, reject and anathematize — This is the true Catholick Faith, out of which there can be no Salvation.

This Usurpation upon the Consciences of Christians (none like whereto was ever known in the World) they prosecute with most uncharitable censures; cursing and damning all who do not in heart and profession submit to him, obliging all their consorts to joyn therein, against all charity and prudence.

Rom. 14. 1.  
15. 1, 7.

The Scripture enjoineeth us to bear with those who are weak in faith, and err in doubtfull or disputable matters.

But the Popes with cruel uncharitableness, not onely do censure all that cannot assent to their devices, which they obtrude as Articles of Faith; but sorely persecute them with all sorts of punishments; even with death it self; a practice inconsistent with Christian meekness, with equity, with reason; and of which the Fathers have expressed the greatest detestation.

They

They have unweaved and altered all Theology from head to foot, and of Divine have made it Sophistical.

*Totam Theologiam à capite usque ad calcem retexerunt, & ex divina & phisicam fecerunt. Erasmi. pref. ad Hieron.*

The Pope with his pack of mercenary Clients at Trent, did indeed establish a Scholastical or Sophistical, rather than a Christian Theology; framing Points, devised by the idle wits of latter times, into Definitions and peremptory Conclusions, back'd with Curfes and Censures: concerning which Conclusions it is evident

That the Apostles themselves would not be able to understand many of them.

That ancient Fathers did never think any thing about them.

That divers of them consist in application of artificial terms and phrases devised by humane subtilty.

That divers of them are in their own nature disputable; were before disputed by wise men, and will ever be disputed by those who freely use their judgment.

That there was no need of defining many of them.

That they blindly lay about them, condemning and cursing they know not who, Fathers, Schoolmen, Divines, &c. who have expressly affirmed points so damned by them.

That many Truths are uncharitably back'd with Curfes, which disparageth them; (seeing a man may err pardonably *in multis peccatis*) in many things we offend all.

For instance; what need was there of defining, what need of cursing those, who think concupiscence to be truly and properly sin, upon Saint Paul's Authority, calling it so?

That Adam presently upon his transgression did lose the Sanctity and justice in which he was constituted.

*transgressus, statim sanctitatem & iustitiam in qua constitutus fuerat amisisse. Ibid. Can. 1.*

What need of cursing those, who say that men are justified by the sole remission of sins, according to Saint Paul's notion, and use of the word Justification?

What need of those, who say the grace of God by which we are justified, is only the favour of God, whereas it is plain enough that God's grace there in Saint Paul, doth signifie nothing else, applied to that case.

Or that Faith is nothing else, but a reliance in God's mercy, remitting sins for Christ; seeing it is plain that Saint Paul doth by Faith chiefly mean the belief of that principal point of the Gospel.

Or that good works do not cause an encrease of justification; seeing Saint Paul doth exclude justification by works; and it is a free work of God — incapable of degrees.

Or that after remission of sin in justification, a guilt of paying temporal pain doth abide.

*valis exolvenda — Sess. 6. Can. 30. Sess. 14. de penis Can. 15.*

Or that a man cannot by his works merit encrease of grace, and glory and eternal life; seeing a man is not to be blamed, who doth dislike the use of so sawcy a word; the which divers good men have disclaimed.

What need of cursing those, who do not take the Sacraments to be precisely Seven? or who conceive that some one of their seven may not be truly and properly a Sacrament; seeing the word Sacra-

ment

*Formaliter  
iustus Sess. 6.  
Can. 10.*

*Ex opere operato  
Sess. 7.  
Can. 8.*

*Character.  
Sess. 7. Can. 9.*

*Sess. 5. Can. 5.  
Rom. 7.*

*ad mandatum  
dei in paradiso  
fuisse.*

*Sess. 6.  
Can. 11.*

*Sess. 6. Can. 11.  
Aut etiam  
gratiam qua  
iustificamur  
esse tantum  
favorem Dei.  
Sess. 6. Can. 12.*

*Sess. 6. Can. 14.  
Non autem opus  
augenda  
causam.*

*Ut nullus remaneat reatus  
penae temporariae.*



De Sacramen-  
tis.

Si quis disci-  
vit.

esse plura vel  
pauciora quam  
septem. Sess. 7.

Can. 1.

Sess. 7. Can. 3.

Sess. 7. Can. 8.

Von imprimi

characterem

in anima.

Sess. 7. Can. 9.

Hoc est signum

quoddam spi-

rituale, & in-

delibile. Ibid.

Sess. 7. Can. 11.

Sess. 7. Can. 13.

Sess. 4.

Fidem minutis dissecant ambagibus

Ut quisque lingua nequior.

Solvunt ligantque questionum vincula

Per Syllogismos plestiles—

Prudent. in Apoc. h. 1.

ment is ambiguous, and by the Fathers applied to divers other things, and defined generally by St. *Austin*, *Signum rei sacrae*; and that before *Peter Lombard* ever did mention that number.

What need of damning those, who do conceive the Sacraments equal in dignity?

What need of defining, that Sacraments do confer grace *ex opere operato*; which is an obscure Scholastical phrase?

What need of cursing those who say, that a *Character* is not im-  
pressed in the soul of those who take *Baptism*, *Confirmation*, or *Orders*?  
seeing what this *Character* is (or *this spiritual and indelible mark*)  
they do not themselves well understand or agree.

What need of cursing those, who do not think that the validity  
of Sacraments (and consequently the assurance of our being *Christi-  
ans*) dependeth on the Intention of the Minister?

What need of cursing those, who think that a *Pastour* of the  
Church may change the Ceremonies of administering the Sacraments;  
seeing St. *Cyprian* often teacheth that every *Pastour* hath full autho-  
rity in such cases within his own precinct?

What need of defining the Second Book of *Maccabees* to be *Can-  
onical*, against the common opinion of the Fathers (most expressly  
of St. *Austin* himself) of the most learned in  
all Ages, of Pope *Gelasius* himself (*in decret.*)  
which the Author himself (calling his work an  
*Epitome*, and asking pardon for his errors) dis-  
claimeth? and which common sense therefore  
disclaimeth.

Their new Creed of *Pius IV.* containeth these novelties and hete-  
rodoxies. 1. *Seven Sacraments.* 2. *Trent Doctrine of Justification  
and Original sin.* 3. *Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass.* 4. *Transub-  
stantiation.* 5. *Communicating under one kind.* 6. *Purgatory.* 7. *In-  
vocation of Saints.* 8. *Veneration of Reliques.* 9. *Worship of Images.*  
10. *The Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.*  
11. *Swearing Obedience to the Pope.* 12. *Receiving the Decrees of all  
Synods and of Trent.*

A  
DISCOURSE  
Concerning the  
UNITY  
OF THE  
CHURCH.

---

By *ISAAC BARROW*, D. D. late Master  
of *Trinity College in Cambridge.*

---

Aug. de Bapt. 3.  
*Non habet Charitatem Dei, qui Ecclesiæ non diligit Unitatem.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for *Brabazon Aylmer*, at the *Three Pigeons*  
against the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhill.* 1700.

<

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.



A  
DISCOURSE  
Concerning the  
UNITY  
OF THE  
CHURCH.

EPHES. IV. 4.

*One Body, and one Spirit.*

**T**HE *Unity of the Church* is a Point which may seem somewhat speculative and remote from Practice; but in right Judgments it is otherwise; many Duties depending upon a true notion and consideration of it; so that from ignorance or mistake about it we may incur divers offences or omissions of Duty; hence in Holy Scripture it is often proposed as a considerable Point, and usefull to Practice.

And if ever the Consideration of it were needfull, it is so now when the Church is so rent with Dissensions; for our satisfaction and direction about the Questions and Cases debated in Christendom; for on the Explication of it, or the true Resolution wherein it doth consist, the Controversies about *Church Government, Heresie, Schism, Liberty of Conscience*, and by consequence many others do depend; yea indeed all others are by some Parties made to depend thereon.

Saint *Paul*, exhorting the *Ephesians*, his disciples, to the maintenance of Charity and Peace among themselves, doth for inducement to that Practice represent the Unity and Community of those things which jointly appertain to them as Christians: the Unity of that *Body* whereof they were members; of that *Spirit* which did animate and act them; of that *Hope* to which they were called; of that *Lord* whom they all did worship and serve; of that *Faith* which they did profess; of that *Baptism* whereby they were admitted into the same state of Duties, of Rights, of Privileges; of that one *God* and universal *Father*, to whom they had all the same relations.

He beginneth with the *Unity of the Body*; that is, of the Christian Church; concerning which Unity, what it is, and wherein it doth consist, I mean now to discourse.

N n

In

In order to clearing which Point, we must first state what the Church is, of which we discourse; for the word *Church* is ambiguous having both in Holy Scripture, and common use, divers senses somewhat different: For,

\* Rom. 16. 5. 1. Sometimes any Assembly or Company of Christians, is called a Church; as when mention is made of \* *the Church in such a house*, (whence *Tertullian* † saith, *Where there are three, even Laicks, there is a Church.*)

2. Sometimes a particular Society of Christians living in spiritual Communion, and under Discipline, as when, \* *the Church at such a Town*; † *the Churches of such a Province*; || the Churches, all the Churches, are mentioned: According to which notions St. *Cyprian* \* saith, that there is a Church, where there is a *People united to a Priest, and a Flock adhering to their Shepherd*: and so *Ignatius* † saith, *that without the Orders of the Clergy a Church is not called.*

† Aët. 9. 31. Gal. 1. 2. 1 Cor. 16. 1, 19. 2 Cor. 8. 1. || Rom. 16. 4. 1 Cor. 4. 17. 11. 16. Aët. 16. 5. Apoc. 2. 7, 11. Kzî' ἐκκλησίαν. Aët. 14. 23. \* *Ecclesia, Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & Pastori suo Grex adherens.* Cyp. Ep. 69. † *Χαεὶς τῶν ἐκκλησία ἐν γλῶσῃ.* Ignat. ad Tral.

3. A larger Collection of divers particular Societies combined together in order, under direction and influence of a common Government, or of Persons acting in the Publick behalf, is termed a Church: as the Church of *Antioch*, of *Corinth*, of *Jerusalem*, &c. each of which at first probably might consist of divers Congregations, having dependencies of less Towns annexed to them: all being united under the care of the Bishop and Presbytery of those places; but however, soon after the Apostles times, it is certain that such Collections were, and were named Churches.

4. The Society of those who at present or in course of time profess the Faith and Gospel of Christ, and undertake the Evangelical Covenant, in distinction to all other Religions: particularly to that of the *Jews*; which is called the Synagogue.

5. The whole body of God's people that is, ever hath been, or ever shall be, from the beginning of the world to the consummation thereof, who having (formally or virtually) believed in Christ and sincerely obeyed God's Laws, shall finally by the meritorious Performances and Sufferings of Christ be saved, is called the Church.

Of these Acceptions the two latter do onely come under present consideration; it being plain that Saint *Paul* doth not speak of any one particular or present Society; but of all at all times who have relation to the same *Lord, Faith, Hope, Sacraments, &c.*

Wherefore, to determine the case between these two, we must observe that to the latter of these (that is, to the Catholick Society of true Believers and faithfull Servants of Christ, diffused through all ages, dispersed through all Countries, where part doth sojourn on Earth, part doth reside in Heaven, part is not yet extant; but all whereof is described in the register of Divine Pre-ordination, and shall be recollected at the resurrection of the just; that I say, to this Church) especially all the glorious Titles and excellent Privileges attributed to the Church in Holy Scripture do agree.

This is *the Body of Christ*, whereof he is *the Head*; and Saviour.

Ephes. 5. 25, 32. Apoc. 16. 7. Matt. 22. 2. 25. L.

This is the Spouse, and Wife of Christ; whereof he is the Bridegroom and Husband.

This

This is the House of God; whereof our Lord is the Master: which is built upon a rock, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

This is the City of God; the new, the holy, the heavenly Jerusalem, the Mother of us all.

This is the Sion, which the Lord hath chosen, which he hath desired for his habitation, where he hath resolved to place his rest and residence for ever.

This is the mountain of the Lord, seated above all mountains, unto which all Nations shall flow.

This is the elect generation, royall Priesthood, holy nation, peculiar people.

This is the general Assembly, and Church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven.

This is the Church which God hath purchased with his own blood; and for which Christ hath delivered himself, that he might sanctifie it, and cleanse it, with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing; but that it might be holy and unblemished.

To this Church as those high Elogies most properly do appertain, so that unity which is often attributed to the Church doth peculiarly belong thereto.

This is that One body, into which we are all baptized by one Spirit; which is knit together, and compacted of parts affording mutual aid, and supply to its nourishment and encrease; the members whereof do hold a mutual sympathy and complacence; which is joyned to one Head, deriving sense and motion from it; which is enlivened, and moved by one Spirit.

This is that one spiritual House, reared upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy Temple in the Lord.

This is that One family of God, whereof Christ is the *οἰκος κεφαλῆς* whence good Christians are *οἰκῶντες αὐτῷ*.

This is that one City, or corporation, endued with an ample Charter and noble Privileges, in regard to which St. Paul saith we are *συμπολίται αὐτῷ ἁγίῳ*, (fellow Citizens of the Saints) and that our *πολίτευμα* (our civil state and capacity) is in Heaven, or that we are Citizens thereof.

That one holy nation, and peculiar People, (the spiritual Israel,) subject to the same Government and Law, (that which is called the Kingdom of Heaven,) enjoying the same Franchises and Privileges, following the same Customs and Fashions; using the same Conversation and Language; whereof Jesus Christ is the Lord and King.

This is the \*one Flock, under one Shepherd.

This is the Society of those for whom Christ did pray, that they might † be all one.

It is true, that divers of these Characters are expressed to relate to the Church after Christ; but they may be allowed to extend to all the faithfull Servants of God before, who in effect were Christians, being saved upon the same account: and therefore did belong to the same Body.

Since men are called Saints, there is a Church upon Earth. *Sancti ante Legem, Sancti sub Legge, Sancti sub Gratia, omnes hi perficientes Corpus Domini in membris sunt Ecclesia constituti.* Greg. Mag. Epist. 24. Saints before the Law. Saints under the Law, Saints under the Gospel, all these make up the Body of Christ, and are reckoned among the members of the Church.

Matth. 24. 13. 1. Tim. 3. 15. Heb. 3. 5.  
1 Pet. 2. 5. Eph. 2. 21. Matth. 16. 18.  
Apoc. 3. 12. 21. 2. 10. Gal. 4. 26.  
Heb. 12. 22.

Psal. 132. 13.

If. 2. 22.

Mic. 4. 1.

1 Pet. 2. 9.

Heb. 12. 23.

Act. 20. 28.

Eph. 5. 25.

1 Cor. 12. 13.

Rom. 12. 5.

Eph. 4. 16.

Col. 2. 19.

1 Cor. 12. 16.

1 Cor. 12. 13.

Eph. 4. 16.

Col. 2. 19.

Heb. 3. 6.

1 Tim. 3. 15.

Mat. 10. 25.

Heb. 12. 22.

Apoc. 3. 12.

21. 2. 10.

Eph. 2. 19.

Phil. 3. 20.

1 Pet. 2. 9.

Ezek. 37. 22.

\* Joh. 10. 16.

Ezek. 37. 24

24. 23.

† Joh. 17. 20,

Ex quo vocantur Sancti, est Ecclesia in terra. Aug. in Psal. 128.



To this Church in a more special and eminent manner all those Titles, and particularly that of *Unity*, are ascribed; but the same also in some order and measure do belong and are attributed to the Universal Church sojourning upon Earth.

For because this visible Church doth enfold the other, (as one Mass doth contain the good Ore and base alloy; as one Floor the Corn and the Chaff; as one Field the Wheat and the Tares; as one Net the choice Fish and the refuse; as one Fold the Sheep and the

One great house hath vessels of honour and dishonour, 2 Tim. 2. 20. (Rom. 9. 21.) Mat. 3. 12. 13. 38, 47.

Joh. 15. 2.

Mat. 13. 30.

Rom. 9. 6. 2. 28.

Joh. 1. 18. Sicut lilium in medio spinarum, ita proxima mea in medio filiarum—Unde filias appellat, nisi propter communionem Sacramentorum? Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 13. As the Lily among Thorns, so is my Love among the Daughters. —Why doth he call them Daughters, but for the communion, and agreement in Sacraments?

Goats; as one Tree the Living and the dry Branches:) Because this Society is designed to be in reality what the other is in appearance, the same with the other: Because therefore presumptively every member of this doth pass for a member of the other, (the time of distinction and separation not being yet come:) Because this in its Profession of Truth, in its Sacrifices of Devotion, in its practice of Service and Duty to God doth communicate with that: Therefore commonly the Titles and Attributes of the one are imparted to the other.

All, saith Saint Paul, are not Israel who are of Israel; nor is he a Jew, that is one outwardly; yet in regard to the conjunction of the rest with the faithful Israelites; because of external Consent in the same Profession and conspiring in the same Services, all the Congregation of Israel is styled a *holy Nation*, and *peculiar People*.

—Unde filias appellat, nisi propter communionem Sacramentorum? Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 13. As the Lily among Thorns, so is my Love among the Daughters. —Why doth he call them Daughters, but for the communion, and agreement in Sacraments?

So likewise do the Apostles speak to all Members of the Church as to elect and holy Persons, unto whom all the Privileges of Christianity do belong; although really Hypocrites and bad men do not belong to the Church, nor are concerned in its *Unity*, as St. Austin doth often teach.

Non ad eam pertinent avari, raptores, facinorosi. Videntur esse in Ecclesia, non sunt. Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. 4. 1. 6. 3. Ecclesiam veram intelligere non audeo nisi in sanctis & iustis. Aug. de Bapt. 5. 27. I dare not understand the true Church to be but among holy and righteous men. Pax autem hujus Unitatis in solis bonis est.—Sicut autem isti qui intus cum gemitu tolerantur, quomodo ad eandem Columba unitatem & illam gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, aut aliquid ejusmodi non pertineant. Idem de Bapt. 3. 18. Nec regenerati spiritualiter in corpus & membra Christi co-adiunguntur nisi boni, &c. Aug. de Unit. 18. Multi tales sunt in Sacramentorum communione cum Ecclesia, & tamen jam non sunt in Ecclesia. Idem de Unit. Eccl. cap. 20. There are many such who communicate in Sacraments with the Church, and yet they are not in the Church. Omnes mali spiritualiter à bonis sejuncti sunt. De Bapt. 6. 4. All evil men are spiritually severed from the good.

in Ecclesia, non sunt. Aug. de Bapt. c. Don. 4. 1. 6. 3. Ecclesiam veram intelligere non audeo nisi in sanctis & iustis. Aug. de Bapt. 5. 27. I dare not understand the true Church to be but among holy and righteous men. Pax autem hujus Unitatis in solis bonis est.—Sicut autem isti qui intus cum gemitu tolerantur, quomodo ad eandem Columba unitatem & illam gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam, aut aliquid ejusmodi non pertineant. Idem de Bapt. 3. 18. Nec regenerati spiritualiter in corpus & membra Christi co-adiunguntur nisi boni, &c. Aug. de Unit. 18. Multi tales sunt in Sacramentorum communione cum Ecclesia, & tamen jam non sunt in Ecclesia. Idem de Unit. Eccl. cap. 20. There are many such who communicate in Sacraments with the Church, and yet they are not in the Church. Omnes mali spiritualiter à bonis sejuncti sunt. De Bapt. 6. 4. All evil men are spiritually severed from the good.

\*Εκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ ἄδελφισμα. ἢ ὁ ἀδελφισμός. Clem. Alex. Str. p. 514. I call the Church the Congregation of the Elect,

The places therefore of Scripture which do represent the Church one, as unquestionably they belong (in their principal notion and intent) to the true universal Church, (called the Church mystical and invisible;)

so may they by analogy and participation be understood to concern the visible Church Catholick here in Earth; which professeth Faith in *Christ*, and Obedience to his Laws.

And of this Church (under due reference to the other) the question is, Wherein the Unity of it doth consist, or upon what grounds it is called one? being that it compriseth in its self so many Persons, Societies and Nations.

For resolution of which Question, we may consider, that a Community of men may be termed one upon several Accounts and Grounds; as,

For special Unity of nature, or as *Unum genus*; so are all men one by participation of common rationality; τὸ Ἀνθρώπων, *Humanum genus*. For

For Cognation of blood; as, *Gens una*; so are all *Jews*, however living dispersedly over the World, reckoned one Nation, or People; so all Kinsmen do constitute one Family: and thus also all Men, as made of one Blood, are one People.

For Commerce of language; so *Italians*, and *Germans*, are esteemed one People, although living under different Laws and Governments.

For Consent in opinion, or Conformity in manners and practices; as, Men of the same Sect in Religion or Philosophy, of the same Profession, Faculty, Trade: so *Jews*, *Mahometans*, *Arians*; so *Oratours*, *Grammarians*, *Logicians*; so *Divines*, *Lawyers*, *Physicians*, *Merchants*, *Artizans*, *Rusticks*, &c.

For Affection of mind, or Compacts of good-will; or for Links of peace and amicable correspondence; in order to mutual interest and aid; as, Friends and Confederates.

For being ranged in order under one Law and Rule; as, those who live under one Monarchy, or in one Commonwealth; as the People in *England*, *Spain*, *France*; in *Venice*, *Genoa*, *Holland*, &c.

Upon such Grounds of Union or Unity a Society of men is denominated One; and, upon divers such accounts, it is plain that the Catholick Church may be said to be One. For,

I. It is evident, that the Church is One by Consent in faith and opinion concerning all principal matters of Doctrine, especially in those which have considerable influence upon the Practice of Piety toward God, Righteousness toward Men, and Sobriety of Conversation; to teach us which the Grace of God did appear.

As he that should in any principal Doctrine differ from Plato (denying the Immortality of the Soul, the Providence of God, the natural difference of Good and Evil;) would not be Platonist; so he that dissenteth from any Doctrine of importance, manifestly taught by Christ, doth renounce Christianity.

All Christians are delivered into one form of doctrine; to which they must stiffly and stedfastly adhere, keeping the Depositum committed to them: They must strive together for the faith of the Gospel; and, earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the Saints: They must hold fast the form of sound words—in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus; that great salvation, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto them by his hearers, God also bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will.

They are bound to mind or think, one and the same thing; to stand fast in one spirit with one mind; to walk by the same rule; to be joyned together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; with one mind and mouth to glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

They are obliged to disclaim Consortship with the Gain-sayers of this Doctrine; to stand off from those who do *ἡρεσίζουσιν*, or who do not consent to the wholesome Words—of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godliness, to mark those who make divisions and scandals beside the Doctrine which Christians had learnt, and to decline from them: To reject Hereticks: To beware of false Prophets, of Seducers; of those who speak perverse things to draw disciples after them: To pronounce Anathema upon whoever shall preach any other Doctrine.

*My sheep hear my voice,*  
Joh. 10. 27.

Tit. 2. 12.  
*Regula fidei sola immobilis & irreformabilis.*  
Tert. de Virg. vel. 1.

Rom. 6. 17.  
Col. 2. 7. Heb. 3. 6. 13. 9.  
1 Cor. 15. 58. Eph. 4. 14.

Jud. 3.  
2 Tim. 1. 13.  
Heb. 2. 3.

*Τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτὸ ὁμοῦν.*  
Phil. 2. 2. 2 Cor. 13. 11.  
Phil. 1. 27. Phil. 3. 16.

1 Cor. 1. 10.  
Rom. 15. 6.  
*Ἀποστασία.*  
1 Tim. 6. 4.  
2 Thess. 3. 16.  
Rom. 16. 17.  
Tit. 3. 10.

Matt. 7. 15. 24. 11. Act. 20. 29, 30.  
2 Pet. 2. 1. Eph. 4. 14.

Gal. 1. 8.  
Thus 3. 28. (16.)

Thus are all Christians one in Christ Jesus: thus are they (as Tertul-

lian speaketh) confederated in the society of a Sacrament, or of one profession.

This preaching and this faith the Church having received, though dispersed over the world, doth carefully hold, as inhabiting one house; and alike believeth these things, as if it had one soul, and the same heart, and consonantly doth preach, and teach, and deliver these things, as if it had but one mouth.

As for Kings, though their Kingdoms be divided yet he equally expects from every one of them one dispensation, and one and the same sacrifice of a true Confession and Praise. So that, though there may seem to be a diversity of temporal ordinances, yet an Unity and Agreement in the right Faith may be held and maintained among them.

In regard to this Union in Faith peculiarly the body of Christians, adhering to it, was called the Catholick Church, from which all those were esteemed *ipso facto* to be cut off and separated who in any point deserted that Faith; such a one (saith Saint Paul) ἐξέστραται, is turned aside, or left the Christian way of life. He in reality is no Christian, nor is to be avowed or treated as such, but is to be disclaimed, rejected and shunned.

He (saith Saint Cyprian) cannot seem a Christian, who doth not persist in the Unity of Christ's Gospel and Faith.

If (saith Tertullian) a man be a Heretick; he cannot be a Christian.

Whence Hegesippus saith of the old Hereticks, that they did divide the Unity of the Church by pernicious speeches against God, and his Christ.

The Vertue (saith the Pastour Hermes, cited by Clemens Alexan.) which doth keep the Church together, is Faith.

So the Fathers of the Sixth Council tell the Emperour that they were members one of another, and did constitute the one body of Christ by consent in opinion with him, and one another; and by faith.

We ought in all things to hold the Unity of the Catholick Church; and not to yield in any thing to the enemies of faith and truth.

In each part of the world this faith is one, because this is the Christian faith.

una est, quia & fides ista Christiana est. Aug. c. Jul. 1. 2. (p. 203. 2.)

Negat Christum, qui non omnia quae Christi sunt confiteretur.

He denies Christ, who confesses not all things that are Christ's.

Ambr. in Luc. lib. 6. cap. 9. p. 90. (Vid. p. 85.)

Hence in common practice, whoever did appear to differ from the common Faith, was rejected as an Apostate from Christianity, and unworthy the communion of other Christians.

There

De societate Sacramenti considerantur Tertull. in Marc. 4. 5.

Τὸ τοῦ κήρυγμα περιληψὺς, καὶ ταύτην πᾶσι πρὸς ἡ Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πρὸς ἕνα τὸν κόσμον διακρινόμεν ἰσχυρῶς φιλάμεται ὡς ἓνα οἶκον οἰκίσαντες καὶ ὁμοίως περὶ τούτων ὡς μίαν ψυχὴν καὶ ἑαυτὴν ἔχουσαν καρδίαν καὶ συνεσφαιρῶς τούτοις κηρύσσεται καὶ διδάσκει, καὶ παραδίδωσι, ὡς ἓν ὅλον καὶ ἑνὸς. Iren. 1. 3. (apud Epiph. Her. 31.)

Reges—Quorum etsi divisa sunt regna, aequaliter tamen de singulis dispensationem exigit, undamque de eis vera de se confessionis hostiam laudis expectat—ut etsi dispositionum temporalium videatur esse diversitas, circa ejus fidei veritatem unitatis consonantia teneatur. (P. Leo. 2. Epist. 5. ad Ervigium R. Hisp.)

Ἐξέστραται ὁ πῖστις, Tit. 3. 10. Rom. 16. 17. 2 Joh. 10.

Nec Christianus videri potest, qui non permanet in Evangelio ejus & fidei veritate. Cyp. de Unit. Eccl.

Si Heretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt. Tert. de Praesc. c. 37.

Οἱ πάντες ἰσχυρῶς καὶ ἑνὸς καὶ ἑκκλησίας ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀγῶνι καὶ πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ πρὸς Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ. Euf. Hist. 4. 22.

Ἡ συνήχουσα πᾶσι Ἐκκλησίαις ἀρετὴ, ἡ πίστις ἐστίν. Herm. apud Clem. Strom. p. 281.

Μελὸν ἀλλήλων ὄντων ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸ ἐν σώματι (ὡς τῶν τῶν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλλήλους ὁμοδοξίας καὶ πίστεως. Conc. VI. Aeth. 18. p. 271.

Per omnia debemus Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitatem tenere, nec aliquis fidei & veritatis hostibus cedere. Cyp. Ep. 71. (ad Quint. de Steph. P.)

Utriusque partis terrarum fides ista una est, quia & fides ista Christiana est.

In each part of the world this faith is one, because this is the Christian faith.

Aug. c. Jul. 1. 2. (p. 203. 2.)

Negat Christum, qui non omnia quae Christi sunt confiteretur.

He denies Christ, who confesses not all things that are Christ's.

Ambr. in Luc. lib. 6. cap. 9. p. 90. (Vid. p. 85.)



There are Points of less moment, more obscurely delivered-----in which Christians with breach of Unity may dissent, about which they may dispute, in which they may err---without breach of Unity, or prejudice to Charity.

*Alia sunt in quibus inter se aliquando etiam doctissimi atque optimi regula Catholica defensores, salva fidei compage non consonant, &c. Aug. c. Jul. 1. 2. p. 205. Totum hoc genus liberat habet observationes. Aug. ad Jan. Ep. 118. Ep. 86. (ad Calal.)*

The Faith of Christians did at first consist in few Points, those which were professed in Baptism, whereof we have divers Summaries in the Ancients--- by analogy whereto all other Propositions were expounded, and according to agreement whereto sound Doctrines were distinguished from false: so that he was accounted orthodox who did not violate them---

So he that holds that immovable Rule of truth which he received at his Baptism, will know the words and sayings and parables which are taken out of the Scriptures, &c.

*Sic autem qui regulam veritatis immobilis apud se habet quam per Baptismum accipit, hæc quidem quæ sunt ex scripturis nomina & dictiones & parabolas cognoscet, &c. Iren. 1. 1. Vid. Gr. (p. 4.)*

II. It is evident, that all Christians are united by the bands of mutual Charity and Good-will.

They are all bound to wish one another well, to have a complacency in the good, and a compassion of the evils incident to each other, to discharge all offices of kindness, succour, consolation to each other.

This is the command of Christ to all; (This is my commandment, Joh. 15. 12. faith he, That ye love one another;) This is the common badge by which his Disciples are discerned and distinguished, Hereby (faith he) shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another: They must have the same love: They must love as Brethren, be compassionate, pitiful, courteous each to other: They must bear one anothers burthens; and, especially, as they have opportunity, doe good to the household of faith. If one member suffer, all the members must suffer with it; and if one member be honoured, all the members must rejoice. The multitude of them who believe must be (like that in the Acts) of one heart, and of one soul. They must walk in love, and doe all things in love.

Whoever therefore doth highly offend against Charity, maligning or mischieving his brethren, doth hereby separate himself from Christ's body, and cease to be a Christian.

They that are enemies to brotherly charity, whether they are openly out of the Church, or seem to be within, they are Pseudo-christians and Anti-christs-- When they seem to be within the Church, they are separated from that invisible conjunction of Charity; Whence Saint John, They went out from us, but were not of us. He saith not, that by their going out they were made aliens, but because they were aliens, therefore he declareth that they went out.

*Hujus autem fraternæ charitatis inimici sive apertè foris sint, sive intus esse videantur, Pseudo-christiani sunt & Anti-christi. Aug. de Bapt. 3. 19. -- Cum intus videntur, ab illa invisibili charitatis compage separati sunt; Unde Johannes, (1 John 2. 19.) Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis-- Non ait quòd exeundo alieni facti sunt, sed quòd alieni erant, propter hoc eos exisse declaravit. Ibid.*

Wherefore the most notorious violations of Charity being the causing of dissensions and factions in the Church, the causeless separation from any Church, the unjust condemnation of Churches---Whoever was guilty of any such unchristian behaviour was rejected by the Fathers, and held to be no Christian. Such were the Novatians, the Donatists, the Meletians, the Luciferians, --- and other Schismatics.

For

Τὶ γὰρ εἰς ἡλίουτο χαλεώσονται, ἢ τοὺς  
ποταμοὺς τῆς πληθύνει τῶν τύπων διεργ-  
μῶν τῇ διατρίβῃ ἀγάπης ἐνωσέντες καὶ τὴν εἰς  
μὴν μιλῶν ἀρμονίαν ἐν σώματι Χριστοῦ δι-  
δάσκ. Bas. Ep. 220.

Ἐπὶ οὗτοι ἀρχαίαν γενομένην— ἡνίκα ἡ-  
δυν αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ αἰνότητι  
πίστεως, ἡνωμένηαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ· ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν  
σώματι μίας συμπολαίας διαφόρων μελῶν  
ὑπαρχούσης. Bas. Ep. 338.

Ἡ καὶ Πνεῦμα Ὑπαρχοντα ἐμπνεῖν  
πέρικτα τῶν ἐκείνων, ἢ ἡμῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς  
τῶν ἀγαπῶν ὑμῶν πανσύνθετον Bas.  
Epist. 182.

Qui ergo compage Charitatis incorporati  
sunt edificio super petram constituto, &c.  
Aug. de Unit. cap. 18.

Membra vero Christi per unitatis chari-  
tatem sibi copulantur, & per eandem capi-  
ti suo coherent, quod est Christus. Aug.  
de Unit. cap. 2.

Omnes Sancti sibi charitate coherent — Aug. de Bapt. 6. 3.

For what can be more acceptable and pleasant than  
to see those who are severed and scattered into so  
many places, yet knit and joyned together in the bond  
and union of charity as harmonious members of the  
body of Christ.

In old time—when the Church of God flourished,  
being rooted in the same faith, united in love: there  
being as it were one conspiracy or league of different  
members in one body.

For the communion of the Spirit is wont to knit and  
unite mens minds, which conjunction we believe to  
be between us and your charitable affection.

They therefore who by the bond of Charity are in-  
corporated into the building settled upon the rock.

But the members of Christ are joined together by  
the charity of union, and by the same cleave close to  
their head, which is Christ.

III. All Christians are united by spiritual cognation and alliance;  
as being all regenerated by the same incorruptible seed, being alike born,  
not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of  
God; whence, as the sons of God, and brethren of Christ, they become  
brethren one to another; so that it is a peculiar title or appella-  
tion of Christians, the brethren signifying all Christian people; and  
a brother being the same with a Christian professour.

1 Pet. 1. 23.  
Jam. 1. 18.  
Joh. 1. 14.  
Gal. 3. 26.  
Joh. 1. 12.  
Heb. 2. 10, 11.  
1 Cor. 7. 15.  
5. 11.  
Rom. 14, 10,  
&c.

IV. The whole Christian Church is one by its incorporation into  
the mystical body of Christ; or as Fellow-subjects of that spiritual,  
heavenly Kingdom, whereof Christ is the sovereign Head and Go-  
vernour; whence they are governed by the same Laws, are obliged  
by the same Institutions and Sanctions; they partake of the same  
Privileges, and are entitled to the same Promises, and encouraged  
by the same Rewards; (being called in one hope of their calling.)

Eph. 4. 4.

Ὁ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς σώματι.  
Rom. 10. 12.  
Εἰ γὰρ ὁ κύριος ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος  
καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος.  
Chrys. in 1 Cor. Orat. 1. Vid.

So they make up one spiritual Corporation, or  
Republick, whereof Christ is the Sovereign Lord.

Though the place disjoin them, yet the Lord joins  
them together, being their common Lord, &c.

Hence an habit of disobedience doth sever a  
man from this Body; for, not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall  
enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, or continue therein. Every such per-  
son who denieth God in works is a Rebel, an Outlaw, renouncing his  
Allegiance, forfeiting his Title to God's protection and favour.

Qui cum non  
sequitur, quo-  
modo se ovem ejus dicere audebit?

Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 10. \* Joh. 10. 27.

Col. 2. 9.

Mendacium est, Christianum se dicere,  
& opera Christi non facere Ambro.  
Qui Christiani nominis epus non agit,  
Christianus non esse videtur. Salv. de  
Gub. D. 4.

He is separated from the Body, by not holding the Head.

'Tis a lie, to call one's self a Christian, and not to  
doe the works of Christ.

He that does not the work of a Christian name,  
seems not to be a Christian.

When

When in stead of the works themselves he begins to oppose even the most apparent truth, whereby he is reprov'd, then he is cut off (from the body, or the Church.)

Hence St. Austin often denieth wicked persons to be in the Church, or to appertain unto its Unity.

For when there is one and the same Lord, that dwelleth in us, he every where joins and couples those that are his with the bond of Unity.

—Cum pro ipsis operibus etiam veritati apertissima, quæ redarguitur, resistere cæperit, tunc præciditur. Aug. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 20.

Nam quum Dominus unus atque idem sit, qui habitat in nobis, conjungit ubique & copulas suos vinculo Unitatis. Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.

V. All Christians are linked together in peaceable concord and confederacy; so that they are bound to live in good correspondence; to communicate in works of Piety and Devotion; to defend and promote the common interest of their Profession.

Upon the entrance of the Gospel by our Lord's Incarnation, it was by a celestial Herald proclaimed, *Peace on earth, and good-will among men.* It was our Lord's office \* to preach Peace. It was a principal end and effect of his Death † to reconcile all men, and to destroy enmity. He specially charged his Disciples, *to maintain Peace one with another,* It was his Will at parting with them, *Peace I leave with you.*

The Apostles frequently do enjoin to pursue Peace with all them who call upon the Lord with a pure heart; to follow the things which make for Peace and edification mutual; to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace.

It was in the Prophecies concerning the Evangelical state declared, that under it, *The Wolfe should dwell with the Lamb, and the Leopard should lie down with the Kid, and the sucking Child should play on the hole of the Asse;* that is, that men of all tempers, and conditions, by virtue of this Institution, should be disposed to live innocently, quietly and lovingly together; so that they should not hurt, or destroy in all God's holy mountain; for that would be a Duty incumbent on the Disciples of this Institution, which all good Christians would observe.

The Evangelical Covenant, as it doth ally us to God, so it doth confederate us together: The Sacraments of this Covenant are also Symbols of Peace and Amity between those who undertake it. Of Baptism it is said, *that so many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ;* and thence, *Ye are all one in Christ Jesus— All in one Spirit have been baptized into one body.* And in the Eucharist, by partaking of one individual Food, they are transmuted into one Body and Substance; *We (saith Saint Paul) being many are one bread, one body; for all of us do partake of one bread.*

By which Sacraments also our people appears to be united: for, *as many grains collected, and ground, and mingled together make one bread; so in Christ, who is the bread of heaven, we may know our selves to be one body, that our company or number be conjoined and united together.*

With us there is both one Church, and one mind, and undivided concord.

Let us hold the peace of the Catholick Church in the unity of concord.

Quo & ipso Sacramento populus noster adunatus ostenditur: ut quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta, & commolita, & commixta, panem unum faciunt; sic in Christo, qui est panis celestis, unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus & adunatus. Cypr. Ep. 63.

Nobis & Ecclesia una, & mens juncta, & individua concordia. Cypr. Ep. 57.

Catholica Ecclesia pacem concordia unitate tenemus. Ep. 45.



*Mauente concordie vinculo, & perseuerante Catholica Ecclesia indiuino Sacramento, &c. Ep. 52. (ad Anton. p. 96.)*

*Qui ergo nec unitatem Spiritus, nec conjunctionem Pacis observat, & se ab Ecclesia vinculo, atque a Sacerdotum collegio sperat, Episcopi nec potestatem potest habere, nec honorem, &c. Ibid. p. 97.*

Phil. 1. 17.

1 Tim. 1. 18.

6. 12.

2 Tim. 4. 7.

Jud. 3.

*Πάντες τὴ μὲν γνάμν δι' ὁμολογίας Ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Δόγμα πῶς πανταχόθεν διακρίνεται. Euseb. 5. 23.*

Cypr. Ep. 67.

*Laborantes hic nos & contra inuidiam impetum totis fidei viribus resistentes, multum Sermo vester adiuvit, &c. Cypr. Ep. 23.*

Thus did the Bishops of several Churches meet to suppress the Heresie of P. Samosatenus.

This was the ground of most Synods.

*Οὗτος οἱ ὡς ταῦτα πανταχὶ πολὺς ἐστὶ πῶς ἐπὶ Αἰγυπτίων ἀδελφῶντες χειρίσματι κοινῷ ὡς συμφέρει τῷ ὡς πῶς πῶς ὡς ἀπὸ ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἐκαστὸς ἐκαστῶν, ταῦτα τεταγμένως πῶς ἀπὸ διακρίνουσιν. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν Σαρδικῇ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀρείῳ λεγόντων ἀγωνισαμένων πῶς ἐν ἀτακτῇ τὴν κείνην ἐξέμπετον οἱ ὡς ἐν ταῦτα τὴν Ἀπλινὰ ἐκινῶν ἐκαστῶν πῶς ἐν δὲ πῶς τῶν ὡς ἐκαστῶν. Syn. Chalced. ad Imper. Conc. Chal. pars 3. p. 78.*

If any dissention or Faction doth arise in any Church, other Churches, upon notice thereof, should yield their aid to quench and suppress it; countenancing the peaceable, checking and disavowing the factious.

Vid. Ep. 42.

(ad Cornel.)

p. 77.

Thus did Saint Cyprian help to discountenance and quash the Novatian Schism.

Thus when the Oriental Churches did labour under the Arian Faction, and Dissentions between the Catholics, St. Basil. (with other Orthodox Bishops consorting with him) did write to the Western Bishops (of Italy and France) to yield their succour.

*Hoc enim vel maxime, frater laboramus, & laborare debemus, ut Unitatem a Domino, & per Apostolorum nobis successoribus traditam, quantum possumus, obtinere curemus & quod in nobis est, &c. Cypr. Ep. 42. p. 78.*

All Christians should be ready, when opportunity doth invite, to admit one another to conjunction in offices of Piety and Charity;

in

The bond of concord remaining, and the individual Sacrament of the Catholick Church continuing, &c.

He therefore that keeps neither the unity of the Spirit, nor the conjunction of Peace, and separates himself from the bond of the Church, and the college (or society) of Priests, can have neither the power of a Bishop, nor the honour.

But particularly, All Christians should assist one another in the common Defence of Truth, Piety and Peace, when they are assaulted, in the Propagation of the Faith, and Enlargement of the Church, which is *συναδελφὴν τὴν πῶς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, to contend together for the faith of the Gospel; to be good Souldiers of Christ; warring the good warfare; — striving for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

Hence if any where any Heresie or bad doctrine should arise, all Christians should be ready to declare against it; that it may not infect, or spread a doubt arising, as in the case of celebrating Easter; They all with one consent, declared by letters the Decree of the Church to all every where.

Especially the Pastours of the Churches are obliged with consent to oppose it.

While we laboured here, and withstood the force of envy with the whole strength of our faith, your Speech assisted us very much.

So they who afterward in all places and several ways were gathered together against the innovations of Hereticks gave their common opinion in behalf of the faith, as being of one mind: what they had approved among themselves in a brotherly way, that they clearly transferred to those who were absent: and they who at the Council of Sardis had earnestly contended against the remainders of Arius, sent their judgment to those of the Eastern Churches: and they who had discovered the infection of Apollinarins, made their opinions known to the Western.

For this, my brother, we must earnestly endeavour, and ought to endeavour, to have a care, as much as in us lies, to hold the Unity delivered to us from the Lord, and by the Apostles, whose successors we are; and what lies in us, &c.

in Prayer, in communion of the Eucharist, in brotherly conversation, and pious conference for edification or advice. Ep. 398.

So that he who flies and avoids communion with us, you in your prudence may know, that such a man breaks himself off from the whole Church.

Saint Chrysostome doth complain of Epiphanius;

Then when he came to the great and holy City Constantinople, he came not out into the Congregation according to custome and the ancient manner, he joyned not himself with us, nor communicated with us in the Word, and Prayer, and the Holy Communion &c.

So Polycarp, being at Rome, did communicate with P. Anicetus.

καὶ οὕτως παρέχοντες ὁ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Πόλεως, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Euseb. 5. 24.

If Dissention arise between divers Churches; another may interpose to reconcile them; as did the Church of Carthage, between that of Rome and Alexandria. Cod. Afr. Can. 101.

If any Bishop were exceedingly negligent in the discharge of his Office, (to the common damage of Truth and Piety,) his neighbour Bishops might admonish him thereto; and, if he should not reform, might deprive him of Communion. Cod. Afr. Can. 123.

All Christians should hold friendly correspondence, as occasion doth serve, and as it is usefull, to signifie consent in Faith, to recommend Persons, to foster Charity, to convey Succour and Advice, to perform all good offices of Amity and Peace.

Siricius who is our Companion, and fellow-labourer, with whom the whole world by mutual commerce of canonical or communicatory Letters agree together with us in one common Society.

Damaso Siricius hodie, qui noster est socius, cum quo nobis totus orbis commercio formatum in una communione societate concordant. Opt. lib. 2. p. 40.

The Catholick Church being one body, 'tis consequent thereto, that we write and signifie one to another, &c.

ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία αὐτῶν ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ γράσειν ἡμᾶς καὶ σημαίνειν ἀλλήλους. Ὁ. Alex. Alexandria. Socr. 1. 6. Theod.

In cases of doubt or difficulty one Church should have recourse to others for Advice; and any Church should yield it.

Both common charity and reason requires, most dear brethren, that we conceal nothing from your knowledge of those things which are done among us, that so there may be common advice taken by us concerning the most usefull way of ordering Ecclesiastical affairs.

Et dilectiq; communis & ratio expedit, fratres charissimi, nihil conscientie vestre subtrahere de his quæ apud nos geruntur, ut sit nobis circa utilitatem Ecclesiasticæ administrationis commune consilium. Cyp. Ep. 29. (ad Cler. Rom.)

One Church should acquaint others of any extraordinary transaction concerning the common Faith or Discipline; requesting their approbation and countenance.

The practice of this we see frequently in Saint Cyprian's Epistles; particularly in Epist. 4, 15, 23, 29, 30, 42, 48. (P. Corn.)

Thus did the Eastern Churches give account to all other Churches of their proceedings against P. Samosatenus.

Which letters are sent all the world over, and brought to the notice of all the Churches and of all the Brethren. Euseb. 7. 30. Quæ litera per totum mundum missa

sunt, & in notitiam Ecclesiis omnibus & universis fratribus perlata sunt Cyp. Ep. 52. (ad Anton. p. 91.) Scripsimus ad Corneliolum collegam nostrum, &c. Ibid.

When any Church or any Pastour was oppressed or injured, he might have recourse to other Churches for their assistance in order to relief.

Habere potestatem ut qui abjunctus est, ut Episcopus finitimos interpellat, & causa ejus audiat ac diligenter tractetur, &c. Conc. Sard. Can. 17. Vid. Cod. Afr. Can. 125.

Let him who is cast out have power to apply himself to the neighbouring Bishops, that his cause may be carefully heard and discussed.

Thus did *Athanasius* (being overborn and expelled from his See by the *Arian* faction) goe for refuge to the Church of *Rome*.

*St. Chrysostome* had recourse to the Bishop of *Rome*, and to those of the *West*, as also to the Bishop of *Antioch*.

VI. Now, because in the transacting of these things, the Pastours have the chief hand, and act in behalf of the Churches which they inspect, therefore is the Church united also by their consent in Doctrine, their agreement in Peace, their maintaining intercourse, their concurrence to preserve Truth and Charity.

Omnes nos decet pro corpore totius Ecclesie, cujus per varias quasque Provincias membra digesta sunt excubare. Cyp. Ep. 30. (Cler. Rom. ad Cyp. P.)

We ought all to be vigilant and carefull for the body of the whole Church, where members are dispersed through many several Provinces.

Quod servis Dei, & maxime Sacerdotibus. Idcirco copiosum corpus est Sacerdotum, &c.

Cyp. Ep. 42. (ad Cornel.)  
Cyp. Ep. 67. (p. 161.)

Quando Ecclesia, que Catholica una est, scissa non sit, neque divisa, sed sit utique connexa, & coherentium sibi invicem Sacerdotum glutino copulata. Cyp. Ep. 69.

Seeing the Church, which is one and Catholick, is not rent nor divided, but truly knit and united together, by the bond of Priests united one to another.

Hoc verecundia & disciplina & vita ipsi omnium convenit: ut Episcopi plures in unum convenientes: disponere omnia consilii communis religione possimus. Cyp. Ep. 14. (Cler. suo.)

This agrees with the modesty and discipline and the very life of all, that many of the Bishops meeting together might order all things in a religious way by common advice.

Ut cum pace à Domino nobis data plures Præpositi convenire in unum caperimus, communicato etiam vobiscum consilio disponere singula & reformare possimus. Cyp. Ep. 15. (Cler. Rom.)

That, since it having pleased God to grant us peace, we begin to have greater meetings of Bishops, we may also by your advice order and reform every thing.

Quod ut simul cum ceteris Collegis nostris stabiliter ac firmiter administramus, atque ut Catholica Ecclesia pacem concordie unanimitate teneamus, perficiet divina dignatio. Cyp. Ep. 52. (ad Cornel.)

Which that, with the rest of our Collegues, we may steadfastly and firmly administer; and that we may keep the peace of the Church, in the unanimity of concord, the divine favour will vouchsafe to accomplish.

Copiosus Episcoporum numerus: in unum convenimus. Cyp. Ep. 45. (ad Anton.)

A great number of Bishops—we met together.

Satis erat, ut tu te Episcopum factum Literis nuntiares. Cyprian. ad Cornel. (Epist. 42.)

Bishops being chosen did acquaint other Bishops with it; It was sufficient (saith *St. Cyprian* to *Cornelius*) that you should by your Letters acquaint us that you were made a Bishop.

Significa plane nobis quis in locum Mariani Arclæ fuerit substitutus, ut sciamus ad quem fratres nostros dirigere, & cui scribere debeamus. Cyp. Ep. 67. P. ad Steph.

Declare plainly to us who is substituted at *Arles* in the room of *Marcian*, that we may know to whom we should direct our brethren, and to whom we should write.

Cyp. Ep. 41, 42, 52. (pag. 93.)  
Theod. 5. 9.  
Euseb. de P. Samos.

All Churches were to ratifie the Elections of Bishops duly made by others, and to communicate with those. And likewise to comply with all reasonable Acts for Communion.

To preserve this Peace and Correspondence, it was a law and Custom, that no Church should admit to Communion those which were excommunicated by another; or who did schismatically divide.

Idem enim omnes credimus operati, in quo deprehendimus eadem omnes censura, & discipline consensione sociati. Cler. Rom. ad Cyp. Epist. 30.

We are believed to have done the same thing, whereby we are found to be all of us associated and joined together by the same agreement in censure and discipline.

The



The Decrees of Bishops were sent to be subscribed.

Sard. P. Leonis II. Ep. 2. (ad Hisp. Epist.) N. B. p. 385. (Tom 5) P. Bened. II. Ep. 16

Vid. Cont.

VII. All Christian Churches are one by a specifical Unity of Discipline, resembling one another in Ecclesiastical administrations, which are regulated by the indispensable Sanctions and Institutions of their Sovereign.

They are all bound to use the same Sacraments, according to the forms appointed by our Lord, not admitting any substantial alteration.

They must uphold that sort of Order, Government and Ministry on all its substantial parts, which God did appoint in the Church, or give thereto, as Saint Paul expresseth it; it being a temerarious and dangerous thing to innovate in those matters which our Lord had a special care to order and settle.

1 Cor. 12. 28.  
Eph. 4. 11.  
Rom. 12. 7.  
Act. 20. 28.

Nor can they continue in the Church that have not retained Divine and Ecclesiastical Discipline, neither in good conversation, nor peaceable life.

Nec remanere  
in Ecclesia  
possunt qui

Deificam & Ecclesiasticam Disciplinam nec aliis sui conversatione, nec morum pace tenuerunt. P. Cerael. apud Cyprian. Ep. 48. Vid. Ep. 73. (ad Jub.)

In lesser matters of Ceremony or Discipline (instituted by humane prudence) Churches may differ, and it is expedient they should do so, in regard to the various circumstances of things, and qualities of persons to which discipline should be accommodated; but no Power ought to abrogate, destroy, or infringe, or violate the main form of Discipline, constituted by Divine appointment.

Ep. Firmil.  
(pag. 198.)  
Aug. Ep. 118.  
& 86. suprad.

Hence, when some Confessours had abetted Novatianus, against Cornelius, thereby (against a fundamental Rule of the Church, necessary for preserving of Peace and Order therein, that but one Bishop should be in one Church,) St \* Cyprian doth thus complain of their proceeding—

\* Graviter enim me, atque contristat, &c. Ep. 44. (ad Confess. Rom.)

(To act any thing) against the Sacrament of Divine ordination and Catholick unity, once delivered, makes an adulterate and contrary head out of the Church.

Contra Sacramentum scilicet traditum Divina dispositionis & Catholica unitatis adulterum & contrarium caput extra Ecclesiam facit. Cyprian. Epist. 42. (ad Cornel.)

--- Forsaking the Lord's Priests contrary to the Evangelical discipline; a new Tradition of a sacrilegious Institution starts up.

—Relictis Domini Sacerdotibus contra Evangelicam disciplinam nova Traditio sacrilege Institutionis exurgat. — Cypr. Ep. 40. (Plebi sue.)

There is one God and one Christ, and one Church, and one See founded upon Peter by the word of the Lord; besides one Altar and one Priesthood, another Altar cannot be erected nor a new Priesthood ordained.

Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & Ecclesia una, & Cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata; aliud Altare constituit, aut Sacerdotium novum fieri præter unum Altare, & unum Sacerdotium non potest. Ibid.

Hence were the Meletians rejected by the Church, for introducing Ordinations—

Hence was Aerius accounted a Heretick, for meaning to innovate in so grand a point of Discipline, as the subordination of Bishops and Presbyters.

VIII. It is expedient that all Churches should conform to each other in great matters of prudential Discipline, although not instituted or prescribed by God: for this is a means of preserving Peace, and is a Beauty or Harmony. For difference of Practice doth alienate Affections, especially in common People.

So the Synod of Nice.

That



none such was then instituted; otherwise he could not have slipped over a Point. so very material and pertinent to his Discourse.

2. By the Apostolical History it may appear, that the Apostles, in the Propagation of Christianity, and founding of Christian Societies, had no meaning, did take no care, to establish any such Polity.

They did resort to several Places (whither Divine instinct, or reasonable occasion did carry them) where, by their Preaching, having convinced and converted a competent number of persons to the embracing Christian Doctrine, they did appoint Pastours to instruct and edifie them, to administer God's Worship and Service among them, to contain them in good order and peace, exhorting them to maintain good correspondence of Charity and Peace with all good Christians otherwhere; this is all we can see done by them.

3. The Fathers, in their set Treatises and in their incidental Discourses about the Unity of the Church, (which was *de facto*, which should be *de jure* in the Church,) do make it to consist onely in those Unions of Faith Charity, Peace, which we have described, not in this political Union.

The Roman Church gave this Reason why they could not admit Marcion into their Communion, they would not doe it without his Father's consent, between whom and them there was one faith and one agreement of mind.

Tertullian in his Apologetick describing the Unity of the Church in his time, faith, *We are one body by our Agreement in religion, our Unity of discipline, and our being in the same Covenant of hope.*

And more exactly and largely in his Prescriptions against Hereticks, the breakers of Unity. *Therefore such and so many Churches are but the same with the first Apostolical one, from which all are derived: Thus they become all first, all Apostolical; whilst they maintain the same Unity; whilst there are a Communion of peace, names of brotherhood and contributions of hospitality among them; the rights of which are kept up by no other means, but the one tradition of the same Mystery.*

*They and we have one Faith, one God, the same Christ, the same Hope, the same Baptism; in a word, we are but one Church.*

And Constantine the Great in his Epistle to the Churches:

*(Our Saviour) would have his Catholick Church to be one: the members of which, though they be divided into many and different places, are yet cherish'd by one Spirit, that is, by the will of God.*

And Gregory the Great.—

*Our Head which is Christ, would therefore have us be his members, that by the joints of Charity and Faith he might make us one body in himself.*

Clem. Alex. defineth the Church;

*A people gathered together out of Jews and Gentiles into one Faith, by the giving of the Testaments fitted into Unity of Faith;*

Ὁ λόγος ἰσχυρὸς. Act. 11. 26.

Χειροτὸν ἵστασιν αὐτοῖς Πρεσβυτέρους καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν. Act. 14. 23.

— μὴ γὰρ ὅτι ἡ πίστις καὶ ἡ μία ἡ δοξολογία. Epiph. hier. 42.

Corpus sumus. de Conscientia religionis & discipline Unitate, & societate. Apol. 39.

Itaque tot ac tanta Ecclesie una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes; sic omnes prima, & omnes Apostolica; dum unam omnes probant Unitatem; Communicatio pacis, & appellatio fraternitatis & confederatio hospitalitatis; qua jurata non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem Sacramenta una traditio. Tertul. Praescript. cap. 20.

Una nobis & illis fides, unus Deus idem Christus, eadem Spes, eadem lavacra, eadem Sacramenta: semel diximus una Ecclesia sumus. Tert. de Virg. vel. 2.

Καὶ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία αὐτῶν ἑστὶν ἡ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτή, οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία αὐτῶν ἑστὶν ἡ μία καὶ ἡ αὐτή. Const. M. in Ep. ad Eccles. Euseb. vit. Const. 3. 18.

Caput nostrum, quod Christus est, ad hoc sua esse membra nos voluit, ut per compagem charitatis & fidei unum nos in se corpus efficeret. Greg. M. Ep. 7. 111.

Ὁ ἐν νόμῳ καὶ ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πίστιν συναρμολογῶν λαός. Strom. 6. init. τὴν καὶ τὰς Διατάξεις θεοῦ οὐκ ἀναρμολογῶν εἰς ἑνότητα & Πίστιν. Str. 7. (p. 516.)

This



Τὴ γὰρ τὴ Ἐκκλησίαν οὕτως συγκαταστήσαντες  
Ἐκκλησίαν ἡ μία, ἢ εἰς πολλὰς κατα-  
στήσαντες βλαβερὰ αἰετῶς· καὶ τὰς ἐν  
ἀρχῇ, (principium,) καὶ τὰς ἐξ ὧν,  
μὲν εἶναι φάμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθά-  
ρικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν εἰς ἑνὴν Πίστεως  
μᾶς καὶ ἑνὴν διχαίαν διδασκαλίαν, μά-  
λιν ἢ καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν μίαν διαφέρου-  
σιν ἑστέρας· Ἐνδὲ τὸ Θεὸς τῷ Κυλί-  
ματι δὲ Ἐνδὲ τὸ Κυλίματι συνάγει  
τὰς ἡδὴ καταστάτους, ὡς ἀναεί-  
σιν, δικαίως ἑστέρας ἀπὸ καταβολῆς  
κόσμου ἐξ ὧν καὶ. Strom. 7. (p. 549.)

*This one Church therefore partakes of the nature of Unity, which Heresies violently endeavour to divide into many; and therefore we affirm the ancient and Catholick Church, whether we respect its constitution or our conception of it, its beginning or its excellency, to be but one; which into the belief of that one Creed which is agreeable to its own peculiar Testaments, or rather to that one and the same Testament, in times however different, by the will of one and the same God through one and the same Lord,*

*doth unite and Combine together all those who are before ordained, whom God hath predestinated, as knowing that they would be just persons, before the foundation of the world.*

Many Passages in the Fathers, applicable to this Point, we have alledged in the foregoing Discourses.

*Catholicam facit simplex & verus intellectus, intelligere singulare, ac verissimum Sacramentum, & Unitas animorum. Opt I. (p. 14.)*

*Ecclesia non parietibus consistit, sed in dogmatum veritate. &c. Hier Pl. 133.*

4. The Constitution of such an Unity doth involve the vesting some Person or some number of Persons with a Sovereign Authority (subordinate to our Lord) to be managed in a certain manner, either absolutely according to pleasure, or limitedly according to certain Rules prescribed to it.

But that there was ever any such Authority constituted, or any Rules Prescribed to it by our Lord or his Apostles doth not appear, and there are divers reasonable presumptions against it.

It is reasonable that whoever claimeth such Authority, should for assuring his Title shew Patents of his Commission, manifestly expressing it; how otherwise can he justly demand Obedience, or any with satisfaction yield thereto?

It was just that the Institution of so great Authority should be fortified with an undoubted Charter, that its Right might be apparent, and the Duty of Subjection might be certain.

If any such Authority had been granted by God, in all likelihood it would have been clearly mentioned in Scripture; it being a matter of high importance among the establishments of Christianity, conducing to great effects, and grounding much duty. Especially considering that

There is in Scripture frequent occasion of mentioning it; in way of History, touching the use of it (the acts of Sovereign Power affording chief matter to the History of any Society) in way of Direction to those Governours how to manage it; in way of Exhortation to Inferiours how to behave themselves in regard to it; in way of commending the Advantages which attend it; it is therefore strange that its mention is so balkt.

The Apostles do often speak concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs of all natures, concerning the Decent administration of things, concerning preservation of Order and Peace, concerning the furtherance of Edification, concerning the Prevention and Removal of Heresies, Schisms, Factions, Disorders; upon any of which occasions it is marvellous that they should not touch that Constitution, which was the proper means appointed for maintenance of Truth, Order, Peace, Decency, Edification, and all such Purposes, for remedy of all contrary Mischiefs.

There

There are mentioned divers Schisms and Dissensions, the which the Apostles did strive by instruction and persuasion to remove; in which Cases, supposing such an Authority in being, it is a wonder that they do not mind the Parties dissenting of having recourse thereto for decision of their Causes, that they do not exhort them to a Submission thereto, that they do not reprove them for declining such a Remedy.

It is also strange, that no mention is made of any appeal made by any of the dissenting Parties to the Judgment of such Authority.

Indeed, if such an Authority had then been avowed by the Christian Churches, it is hardly conceivable that any Schisms could subsist, there being so powerfull a Remedy against them; then notably visible and most effectual, because of its fresh Institution, before it was darkened or weakened by Age.

Whereas the Apostolical Writings do inculcate our Subjection to one Lord in Heaven, it is much they should never consider his Vicegerent, or Vicegerents, upon Earth; notifying and pressing the Duties of Obedience and Reverence toward them.

There are indeed Exhortations to honour the Elders, and to obey the Guides of particular Churches; but the Honour and Obedience due to those Paramount Authorities, or Universal Governours, is passed over in dead silence, as if no such thing had been thought of.

They do expressly avow the secular Pre-eminence, and press Submission to the Emperour as Supreme; why do they not likewise mention this no less considerable Ecclesiastical Supremacy, or enjoin Obedience thereto? why *Honour the King*, and be *subject to Principalities* so often, but Honour the spiritual Prince or Senate doth never occur?

Rom. 13. 1. — Tit. 3. 1.  
1 Pet. 2. 13, 17. 1 Tim. 1. 2.

If there had been any such Authority, there would probably have been some intimation concerning the Persons in whom it was settled, concerning the Place of their residence, concerning the Manner of its being conveyed, (by Election, Succession, or otherwise.)

Probably the Persons would have some proper Name, Title or Character to distinguish them from inferiour Governours; that to the Place some mark of Pre-eminence would have been affixed.

It is not unlikely, that somewhere some Rules or Directions would have been prescribed for the management of so high a Trust, for preventing Miscarriages and Abuses to which it is notoriously liable.

It would have been declared Absolute, or the Limits of it would have been determined, to prevent its enslaving God's heritage.

But of these things in the Apostolical Writings, or in any near those times, there doth not appear any footstep or pregnant intimation.

There hath never to this day been any place but one (namely *Rome*) which hath pretended to be the Seat of such an Authority; the Plea whereof we largely have examined.

At present we shall only observe, that before the *Roman Church* was founded, there were Churches elsewhere; there was a great Church at *Jerusalem* (which indeed was the *Mother of all Churches*, and was by the Fathers so styled, however *Rome* now arrogates to her self that Title.) There were issuing from that Mother a fair Offspring of Churches (those of *Judea*, of *Galilee*, of *Samaria*, of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, of

Act. 2. 41, 47. 4. 4. 6. 1. 8. 1;  
ΕΠΑΝΘΥΝΕΤΟ ΑΙΕΙΔΜΟΣ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ Ω  
ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΙΜΙ ΣΦΕΔΡΑ. Act. 6. 7.  
ΜΑΓΕΡ ΑΠΟΘΩΝ ΨΥ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ Η Ώ  
Ι ΕΡΕΣΛΥΜΟΙΣ. Conc. Const. in Synod. Ec.  
Theod. 5. 9.

Acts. 9. 31. 15. divers other places) before there was any Church at *Rome*, or that  
 41. 11. 19. Saint *Peter* did come thither; which was at least divers years after  
 8. 1. our Lord's Ascension. Saint *Paul* was converted --- after five years  
 1 Cor. 16. 1, he went to *Hierusalem*, then Saint *Peter* was there; after fourteen  
 19. years thence he went to *Hierusalem* again, and then Saint *Peter* was  
 Rom. 16. 4. there; after that, he met with Saint *Peter* at *Antioch*. Where then  
 Valef. in was this Authority seated? How then did the political Unity of  
 Euseb. 2. 16. the Church subsist? Was the Seat of the Sovereign Authority first  
 Gal. 1. 18, 19. resident at *Jernusalem*, when Saint *Peter* preached there? did it walk  
 2. 1, 9, 11. thence to *Antiochia*, fixing it self there for seven years? Was  
 it thence translated to *Rome*, and settled there ever since? Did this  
 roving and inconstancy become it?

5. The primitive State of the Church did not well comport with such an Unity.

For Christian Churches were founded in distant places, as the Apostles did find opportunity, or received direction to found them; which therefore could not, without extreme inconvenience, have resort or reference to one Authority, any where fixed.

Each Church therefore separately did order its own Affairs, without recourse to others, except for charitable Advice or Relief in cases of extraordinary difficulty or urgent need.

Each Church was endowed with a perfect Liberty and a full Authority, without dependence or subordination to others, to govern its own Members, to manage its own Affairs, to decide Controversies and Causes incident among themselves, without allowing Appeals, or rendring Accounts to others.

Apoc. 2. & 3. This appeareth by the Apostolical Writings of Saint *Paul* and  
 1 Cor. 14. 40. Saint *John* to single Churches; wherein they are supposed able to  
 1 Theff. 5. 14. exercise spiritual Power for establishing Decency, removing Disorders,  
 1 Cor. 5. 12. correcting Offences, deciding Causes, &c.  
 6. 1.

6. This *Autonomia*, and Liberty of Churches, doth appear to have long continued in practice inviolate; although tempered and modelled in accommodation to the circumstances of place and time.

It is true, that if any Church did notoriously forsake the Truth, or commit Disorder in any kind, other Churches did sometime take upon them (as the Case did move) to warn, advise, reprove it, and to declare against its proceedings, as prejudicial not onely to the welfare of that Church, but to the common interests of Truth and Peace; but this was not in way of Commanding Authority, but of fraternal Solitude; or of that Liberty which Equity and Prudence do allow to Equals in regard to common good: So did the *Roman* Church interpose in reclaiming the Church of *Corinth* from its Disorders and Seditions: So did Saint *Cyprian* and Saint *Denys* of *Alex.* meddle in the Affairs of the *Roman* Church, exhorting *Novatian* and his adherents to return to the Peace of their Church.  
 Iren. 3. c. 2.

It is also true, that the Bishops of several adjacent Churches did use to meet upon Emergencies (concerning the maintenance of Truth, Order and Peace; concerning Settlement and Approbation of Paltours, &c.) to consult and conclude upon Expedients for attaining such Ends; this probably they did at first in a free way, without rule, according to occasion, as Prudence suggested; but afterwards, by confederation and consent, those Conventions were formed into method, and regulated by certain Orders established



lished by consent, whence did arise an Ecclesiastical Unity of Government, within certain Precincts; much like that of the United States in the *Netherlands*; the which course was very prudential; and usefull for perserving the Truth of Religion and Unity of Faith against heretical Devices springing up in that free age; for maintaining Concord and good Correspondence among Christians, together with an Harmony in Manners and Discipline; for that otherwise Christendom would have been shattered and crumbled into numberless Parties, discordant in Opinion and Practice; and consequently alienated in Affection, which inevitably among most men doth follow Difference of Opinion and Manners; so that in short time it would not have appeared what Christianity was, and consequently the Religion, being overgrown with Differences and Discords, must have perished.

Thus in the case, about admitting the *Lapsi* to Communion, Saint *Cyprian* relates, when the persecution [of *Decius*] ceased, so that leave was now given us to meet in one place together, a considerable number of Bishops whom their own faith and God's protection had preserved sound and entire [from the late Apostasie and Persecution] being assembled, we deliberated of the composition of the matter with wholsome moderation, &c.

Which thing also *Agrippinus* of blessed memory with his other Fellow-bishops who then governed the Church of Christ in the African Province and in Numidia did establish; and by the well-weighed examination of the common advice of them all together confirmed it.

Thus it was the custome in the Churches of *Asia*, as *Frigidian* telleth us in those words:

Upon which occasion it necessarily happens, that every year we the Elders and Rulers do come together to regulate those things which are committed to our care; that if there should be any things of greater moment, by common advice they be determined—

Yet while things went thus, in order to common Truth and Peace; every Church in more private matters, touching its own particular state, did retain its Liberty and Authority, without being subject or accountable to any but the common Lord; in such cases even Synods of Bishops did not think it proper or just for them to interpose, to the prejudice of that Liberty and Power which derived from a higher Source.

*dicantes aut à jure communionis aliquem si diversum senserit amoventes, — &c. Vid. Cons. Carthag. apud Cypr. p. 399. Vid. Syn. Ant. Can. 9.*

These things are very apparent, as by the course of Ecclesiastical History, so particularly in that most pretious Monument of Antiquity, St. *Cyprian's* Epistles; by which it is most evident, that in those times every Bishop or Pastour was conceived to have a double relation or capacity; one toward his own Flock, another toward the whole Flock: One toward his own Flock; by virtue of which, \* taking advice of his Presbyters, together with the conscience of his People assisting, did order all things tending to particular Edification, Order Peace, Reformation, Censure, &c. without fear of

P p 2

being

*Persecutione sopita, cum data esset facultas in unum conveniendi, copiosus Episcoporum numerus, quos integros & incolumes fides sua ac Domini tutela protegit, in unum convenimus, & scripturis diu ex utraque parte prolatis, temperamentum salubri moderatione libravimus, &c. Cypr. Ep. 52. (ad Antonian.)*

*Quod quidem & Agrippinus bone memorie vir cum ceteris Co-episcopis suis qui illa tempore Provincia Africa & Numidia Ecclesiam Domini gubernabant, statuit & librato concilii communis examine firmavit. Cypr. Epist. 71. ad Quint.)*

*Qua ex causa necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos Seniores & Praepositi in unum conveniamus, ad disponenda ea quae curae nostrae commissa sunt; ut si quae graviora sunt, communis consilii dirigantur— Cypr. Ep. 75.*

*Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli quid sentiamus, proferamus, neminem ju-*

*\* Vide Epist. 28. 39. 14. 18: Sub Populi assistentia consensu Cypr. Epist. 78.*

— *Actum suum* being troubled by Appeals, or being liable to give any account but to his own Lord, whose Vicegerent he was.

*disponit, & dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.* Cypr. Ep. 52. Every Bishop ordereth and directeth his own acts, being to render an account of his purpose to the Lord.

*Cum statutum sit omnibus nobis ac equum sit pariter ac justum, ut unusquisque causa illis audiat, ubi est crimen admissum; & singulis Pastoribus portio Gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque Præpositus rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.* Cypr. Ep. 55. ad—

Since it is ordained by us all, and it is likewise just and equal that every man's cause should be there judged where the crime is committed, and to each Pastour a portion of the Flock is assigned, which is to rule and govern, being to give an account of his act to the Lord.

*Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, nec legem damus, cum habeat in Ecclesie administratione voluntatis sua liberum arbitrium unusquisque Præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.* Cypr. Ep. 72. ad Steph. P. Vide Ep. 72. p. 186. Ep. 76. p. 212.

In which matter neither do we offer violence to any man, or prescribe any Law, since every Bishop hath in the government of his Church the free power of his will, being to render an account of his own act unto the Lord.

Another toward the whole Church, in behalf of his People; upon account whereof he did (according to occasion or order) apply himself to confer with other Bishops for preservation of the common Truth and Peace, when they could not otherwise be well upheld, than by the joint conspiring of the Pastours of divers Churches.

So that the Case of Bishops was like to that of Princes; each of whom hath a free Superintendence in his own Territory, but for to uphold Justice and Peace in the World, or between adjacent Nations the entercourse of several Princes is needfull.

The Peace of the Church was preserved by communion of all Parts together, not by the Subjection of the rest to one Part.

7. This political Unity doth not well accord with the nature and genius of the Evangelical dispensation.

Our Saviour affirmed, that *his Kingdom is not of this World*; and St. Paul telleth us, that it consisteth in a Spiritual influence upon the Souls of men; producing in them Virtue, Spiritual Joy and Peace.

It disfavoweth and discountenanceth *the elements of the World*, by which worldly designs are carried on, and worldly frames sustained.

It requireth not to be managed by politick artifices or *fleshly wisdom*, but by Simplicity, Sincerity, Plain-dealing: as every Subject of it must lay aside all *guile and dissimulation*, so especially the Officers of it must doe so, in conformity to the Apostles, who *had their conversation in the world* (and prosecuted their design) *in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God; not walking in craftiness, or handling the word of God deceitfully; &c.*

It needeth not to be supported or enlarged by wealth and pomp, or by compulsive force and violence; for *God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, and base, despicable things, &c. that no flesh should glory in his presence.*

And, *The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God, &c.*

It discountenanceth the imposition of new Laws and Precepts, beside those which God hath joined, or which are necessary for order and edification; derogating from the Liberty of Christians and from the Simplicity of our Religion.

The Government of the Christian state is represented purely spiritual; administred by meek persuation, not by imperious awe; as an humble ministry, not as stately domination; for the Apostles themselves did not *Lord it over mens faith*, but *did co-operate to their joy*; they did *not preach themselves, but Christ Jesus to be our Lord; and themselves their servants for Jesus.*

It

It is expressly forbidden to them, to domineer over God's people  
They are to be qualified with Gentleness and Patience; they are forbidden to strive, and enjoined to be gentle toward all, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves.  
They are to convince, to rebuke, to exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine.

1 Pet. 5. 3.  
Matt. 20, 25, 26.  
1 Cor. 6. 4.  
1 Tim. 3. 3.  
Tit. 2. 2.  
2 Tim. 2. 24, 25.  
Chryf. Irid.  
2 Tim. 4. 2 Episcopus præst. valentibus, non molentibus Hier. Ep. 3. (ad Nepot.)

They are furnished with no arms beside the divine Panoply; they bear no sword, but that of the Spirit; which is the word of God, — they may teach, reprove, — they cannot compell —  
They are not to be entangled in the cares of this life.

Αναλ. 3ετς  
† παροψία  
Θ. 2.  
Eph. 6. 13.  
6. 17.  
2 Tim. 2. 4.  
Chryf.

Μαλιστα ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν χειριστῶν ἐκ ἡρώτων πρὸς βίαν ἵκανοὶ δὲν τὰ ἑλὶ ἀμαρτῶν αὐτῶν πλάτματα  
de Sacerd. 2.  
Ἐλευθερία ἡ βιαζομένη. ἀλλὰ πειθὺν αὐτὴν ποιεῖν ἀλίσκω τὴν πειθὺν.

But supposing the Church was designed to be one in this manner of political reigment, it must be quite another thing, nearly resembling a worldly state, yea in effect soon resolving it self into such an one; supposing, as is now pretended, that its managment is committed to an Ecclesiastical Monarch, it must become a worldly Kingdom; for such a Polity could not be upheld without applying the same means and engines, without practising the same methods and arts, whereby secular Governments are maintained.

Επεὶ π  
πολλὰ τὰς πο  
λλὰς ἐργασ  
οὐ σκεπτικ  
Arist. Pol. IV.  
15.

Its Majesty must be supported by conspicuous Pomp and Phantastry.  
Its Dignity and Power must be supported by Wealth; which it must corrade and accumulate by large Incomes, by exaction of Tributes and Taxes.

It must exert Authority in enacting of Laws for keeping its State in order, and securing its Interests, backed with Rewards and Pains; especially considering, its Title being so dark and grounded on no clear warrant, many always will contest it.

It must apply Constraint and Force, for procuring Obedience, and correcting Transgression.

It must have Guards to preserve its Safety and Authority.

It must be engaged in Wars, to defend its self and make good its Interests.

It must use Subtilty and Artifice, for promoting its Interests, and countermining the Policies of adversaries.

It must erect Judicatories, and must decide Causes with Formality of legal process; whence tedious Suits, crafty Pleadings, Quirks of Law and Pettifoggeries, Fees and Charges, Extortion and Barretry, &c. will necessarily creep in.

Is modus qui  
frequentatur  
execrabiles  
plani. & qui  
non dico Ec-

clesiam, sed nec forum deceret, &c. Bern. de Confid. l. 10. Attendens itaque S. Synodus, quid spiritualis sine carnalibus sustineri nequeant. Syn. Bass. Sess. 42. p. 108.

All which things do much disagree from the original constitution and design of the Christian Church, which is averse from pomp, doth reject domination, doth not require craft, wealth or force to maintain it; but did at first, and may subsist without any such means.

Omnis pul-  
chritudo filie  
Regis intrin-  
secus. Aug.  
Ep. 68.

I do not say, that an Ecclesiastical Society may not lawfully, for its support, use Power, Policy, Wealth, in some measure to uphold or defend it self; but that a Constitution needing such things is Divine; or that so far as it doth use them, it is no more than Humane.

Thus



Thus in effect we see that it hath succeeded, from the Pretence of this Unity; the which hath indeed transformed the Church into a mere worldly state; wherein the Monarch beareth the garb of an Emperour, in external splendor surpassing all worldly Princes; crowned with a triple Crown.

One Crown doth serve an Emperour. but he must have a triple: to kiss the hands of a King is a sufficient respect, but you cannot salute him without kissing his blessed feet.

He assumeth the most haughty Titles of, *Our most holy Lord*, the Vicar general of *Christ*, &c. and he suffereth men to call him the Monarch of Kings, &c.

That which *Seneca* did take for a piece of enormous Pride in *Caligula*.  
*De Benef. 2. 12.*

Cardin. *vid.*  
*Uss. p. 103.*

He hath Respects paid him, like to which no Potentate doth assume, (having his Feet kissed, riding upon the backs of men, letting Princes hold his Stirrup and lead his Horse.)

He hath a Court, and is attended with a traine of Courtiers surpassing in State and claiming Precedence to the Peers of any Kingdom. He is encompassed with armed Guards: *Switzers*.

He hath a vast Revenue, supplied by Tributes and Imposts, fore and grievous; the exaction which hath made divers Nations of Christendom to groan most lamentably.

He hath raised numberless Wars and Commotions for the promotion and advancement of his Interests.

He administred things with all depth of Policy, to advance his Designs.

*Sub Mortali.*

He imposes rigorous Oaths of Fealty and Obedience.

He hath enacted Volumes of Laws and Decrees to which Obedience is exacted with rigour and forcible constraint.

He draweth gift from all Parts to his courts of Judgment, wherein all formalities of suspense, all the tricks of squeezing money, &c. are practised, to the great trouble and charge of Parties concerned.

*Exaltatio, & inflatio, & arrogans ac superba jactatio;*

*non de Christi magisterio, qui humilitatem docet, sed de Antichristi spiritu nascitur.*  
*Cypri. Ep. 55. (ad P. Cornel.)*

Briefly, it is plain, that he doth exercise the proudest, mightiest, subtlest Domination that ever was over Christians.

8 The Union of the whole Church in one Body, under one Government or Sovereign Authority, would be inconvenient and hurtfull; prejudicial to the main designs of Christianity; destructive to the Welfare and Peace of Mankind in many respects.

This we have shewed particularly concerning the Pretence of the Papacy; and those Discourses being applicable to any like Universal Authority, (perhaps with more advantage, Monarchy being less subject to abuse than other ways of Government) I shall forbear to say more.

9 Such an Union is of no need, would be of small use, or would do little good; in balance to the great Mischiefs and Inconveniences which it would produce.

This point also we have declared, in regard to the Papacy; and we might say the same concerning any other like Authority substituted thereto.

Such a Connexion of Churches it is not any-wise needfull or expedient to the Design of Christianity; which is to reduce Mankind to the Knowledge, Love and Reverence of God; to a just and loving Conver-

Conversation together; to the practice of Sobriety, Temperance, Purity, Meekness, and all other Virtues; all which things may be compassed without forming men into such a policy. Tit. 2. 12.

It is expedient there should be particular Societies in which men may concur in worshipping God, and promoting that design by instructing and provoking one another to good practice, in a regular, decent and orderly way.

It is convenient that the Subjects of each temporal Sovereignty should live as in a civil, so in a spiritual Uniformity, in order to the preservation of Goodwill and Peace among them (for that Neighbours differing in opinion and fashions of practice will be apt to contend each for his way, and thence to disaffect one another) for the Beauty and pleasant harmony of agreement in Divine things, for the more commodious succour and defence of Truth and Piety by unanimous concurrence.

But that all the World should be so joined is needless; and will be apt to produce more mischief than benefit.

11. The Church in the Scripture sense hath ever continued One; and will ever continue so; notwithstanding that it hath not had this political Unity.

12. It is in fact apparent, that Churches have not been thus united, which yet have continued Catholick and Christian.

It were great, no less folly than uncharitableness to say, that the Greek Church hath been none.

There is no Church that hath in effect less reason than that of Rome to prescribe to others.

13. The reasons alledged in proof of such an Unity are insufficient and inconcluding; the which (with great diligence, although not with like perspicuity) advanced by a late Divine of great repute, and collected out of his Writings with some care, are those which briefly proposed do follow; together with Answers declaring their invalidity.

*Arg. I.* The name *Church* is attributed to the whole body of Christians; which implieth Unity. Epil. p. 38.  
Lst. p. 114.

*Ans.* This indeed doth imply an Unity of the Church, but determineth not the kind or ground thereof: there being several kinds of Unity; one of those which we have touched, or several, or all of them may suffice to ground that comprehensive Appellation.

*Arg. II.* Our Creeds do import the belief of such an Unity; for in the *Apostolical* we profess to believe the *Holy Catholick Church*; in the *Constantinopolitan*, the *Holy Catholick* and *Apostolick Church*. Epil. Lst. 144.

*Ans.* 1. The most ancient Summaries of Christian Faith, extant in the first Fathers, (*Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, &c.) do not contain this Point. Iren. Tert.  
Cyp.  
Conc. Nic.

The word *Catholick* was not originally in the *Apostolical* (or *Roman*) Creed, but was added after *Ruffin* in Saint *Austin's* time.

This Article was inserted into the Creeds upon the rise of Heresies and Schisms to discountenance and disengage from them.

*Ans.* 2. We do avow a Catholick Church in many respects One; wherefore not the Unity of the Church, but the Kind and Manner of Unity being in question, the Creed doth not oppose what we say, nor can with reason be alledged for the special kind of Unity which is pretended.

*Ans.*

*Anfw. 3.* That the Unity mentioned in the *Constantinopolitan Creed* is such as our Adversaries contend for, of external Policy, is precariously assumed, and relieth onely upon their interpretation obtruded on us.

*Anfw. 4.* The genuine meaning of that Article may reasonably be deemed this; That we profess our adhering to the Body of Christians, which diffused over the World doth retain the Faith taught, the Discipline settled, the Practices appointed by our Lord and his Apostles; that we maintain general Charity toward all good Christians, that we are ready to entertain communion in Holy Offices with all such; that we are willing to observe the Laws and Orders established by Authority or Consent of the Churches, for maintenance of Truth, Order and Peace: that we renounce all heretical doctrines, all disorderly practices, all conspiracy with any factious combinations of people.

*Anfw. 5.* That this is the meaning of the Article, may sufficiently appear from the reason and occasion of introducing it; which was to secure the Truth of Christian Doctrine, the Authority of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the common Peace of the Church; according to the Discourses and Arguments of the Fathers, (*Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Austin, Vincentius Lirinensis,*) the which do plainly countenance our Interpretation.

*Anfw. 6.* It is not reasonable to interpret the Article so as will not consist with the state of the Church in the Apostolical and most primitive ages, when evidently there was no such a political Conjunction of Christians.

*Arg. III.* The Apostles delivered one Rule of Faith to all Churches, the embracing and professing whereof, celebrated in Baptism, was a necessary condition to the admission into the Church, and to continuance therein; therefore Christians are combined together in one political Body.

*Anfw. 1.* The Consequence is very weak; for from the Antecedent it can onely be inferred, that (according to the Sentiment of the Ancients,) all Christians should consent in one Faith; which Unity we avow; and who denieth?

*Anfw. 2.* By like reason all Mankind must be united in one political Body; because all men are bound to agree in what the Light of nature discovereth to be true and good; or because the Principles of natural Religion, Justice and Humanity are common to all.

*Arg. IV.* God hath granted to the Church certain Powers and Rights, as *Jura Majestatis*; namely, the Power of the Keys, (to admit into, to exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven,) a Power to enact Laws, (for maintenance of its Order and Peace, for its edification and Welfare:) a Power to correct and excommunicate Offenders; a Power to hold Assemblies for God's Service; a Power to ordain Governours and Pastours.

*Anfw. 1.* These Powers are granted to the Church, because granted to each particular Church or distinct Society of Christians; not to the whole as such or distinct from the Parts.

*Anfw. 2.* It is evident that by virtue of such Grants particular Churches do exercise those Powers; and it is impossible to infer more from them than a Justification of their Practice.

*Anfw. 3.* *St. Cyprian* often from that common Grant doth infer the Right of exercising Discipline in each particular Church; which Inference would not be good, but upon our Supposition; nor indeed

Παρονομα-  
ζουσι.

Ep. p. 47.  
Lat. p. 144,  
151.

Epil. p. 37, 49.  
Lat. p. 153.  
p. 118.  
Lages ferre.  
Lat. p. 171.

Lat. p. 54.



indeed otherwise would any particular Church have ground for its Authority.

*Ans. 4.* God hath granted the like Rights to all Princes and States; but doth it thence follow, that all Kingdoms and States must be united in one single Regiment? the Consequence is just the same as as in our Case.

*Arg. V.* All Churches were tied to observe the same Laws or Rules of Practice, the same Orders of Discipline and Customes; therefore all do make one Corporation.

*Ans. 1.* That all Churches are bound to observe the same Divine Institutions, doth argue onely an Unity of relation to the same Heavenly King, or a specifical Unity and Similitude of Policy, the which we do avow.

*Ans. 2.* We do also acknowledge it convenient and decent, that all Churches in principal Observances, introduced by humane prudence, should agree so near as may be; an Uniformity in such things representing and preserving Unity of Faith, of Charity, of Peace.

Whence the Governours of the primitive Church did endeavour such an Uniformity; as the Fathers of Nice profess in the Canon forbidding of Genu-flexion on Lord's days, and in the days of Pentecost.

*Utrum de munda et munda munda et munda q. ad hunc. Conc. Nic. Can. 20. Vide de Paschate.*

*Ans. 3.* Yet doth not such an agreement, or attempt at it, infer a political Unity; no more than when all men, by virtue of a primitive general Tradition, were tied to offer Sacrifice and oblations to God; that Consideration might argue all men to have been under the same Government: or no more than the usual Agreement of neighbour Nations in divers fashions doth conclude such an Unity.

*Ans. 4.* In divers Customes and Observances several Churches did vary, with allowance; which doth rather infer a difference of Polity, than agreement in other Observances doth argue an Unity thereof.

*Vide Aug. Epist. 86. (ad*

*Casul.) Ep. 118. ad Jan. Cypr. Ep. 75. p. 198. Iren. apud Euseb. 5. 24. Socr. 5. 22. 7. 19. —Cetera jam disciplina & conversationis admittunt novitatem correctionis, hac lege manente, &c. Tert. de Virg. vel Thorn. Lat. p. 219. P. Greg. I. in una fide nihil officit sanctæ Ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. P. Greg. I. Epist. 1. 41. P. Leo. IX. Epist. 1. cap. 29. Nil obsunt salu: i credentium diversæ pro loco & tempore consuetudines, quando una fides per dilectionem operans bona quæ potest uni Deo commendat omnes. P. Nic. I. Ep. 6. De consuetudinibus quidem, quæ nobis opponere visi estis, scribentes per diversas Ecclesias diversas esse consuetudines, si illis canonica non resistit auctoritas, pro qua eis obviare debemus, nil judicamus vel eis resistimus, &c.*

*Ans. 5.* St. Cyprian doth affirm, that in such matters every Bishop Cypr. Ep. 73. had a Power to use his own discretion, without being obliged to comply with others.

*Arg. VI.* The Jewish Church was one Corporation; and in correspondence thereto the Christian Church should be such.

*Ep. p. 39. Lat. p. 159.*

*Ans. 1.* As the Christian Church doth in some things correspond to that of the Jews, so it differeth in others, being designed to excel it: wherefore this Argumentation cannot be valid; and may as well be employed for our Opinion as against it.

*Ans. 2.* In like manner it may be argued, that all Christians should annually meet in one place; that all Christians should have one Archpriest on Earth; that we should all be subject to one temporal Jurisdiction; that we should all speak one Language, &c.

*Ans. 3.* There is a great difference in the case; for the Israelites were one small Nation, which conveniently might be embodied; but the Christian Church should consist of all Nations, which rendereth Correspondence in this particular unpracticable, at least without great inconvenience.

Euf. Hist. 1. 4.  
Baron. App. 21.

*Ans. 4.* Before the Law Christian Religion, and consequently a Christian Church, did in substance subsist; but what Unity of Government was there then?

*Ans. 5.* The Temporal Union of the Jews might only figure the spiritual Unity of Christians in Faith, Charity and Peace.

Ep. p. 51--55.  
Lat. p. 157.

*Arg. VII.* All Ecclesiastical Power was derived from the same Fountains, by succession from the Apostles; therefore the Church was one political Body.

Iren. 3. 3.  
Tert. Præscr.  
31, 32.

*Ans. 1.* Thence we may rather infer, that Churches are not so united, because the Founders of them were several Persons endowed with co-ordinate and equal Power.

*Ans. 2.* The Apostles did in several Churches constitute Bishops, independent from each other; and the like may be now, either by succession from those, or by the constitutions of humane prudence, according to emergences of occasion and circumstances of things.

*Ans. 3.* Divers Churches were *Αὐτονομίαι* and all were so according to Saint Cyprian.

*Ans. 4.* All temporal power is derived from Adam, and the Patriarchs, ancient Fathers of families; Doth it thence follow, that all the World must be under one secular Government?

*Arg. VIII.* All Churches did exercise a Power of Excommunication, or of excluding Hereticks, Schismaticks, disorderly and scandalous people.

Ep. p. 59.  
p. 125.  
Lat. p. 185.  
p. 195.

*Ans. 1.* Each Church was vested with this Power; this doth therefore only infer a resemblance of several Churches in Discipline; which we avow.

*Ans. 2.* This argueth that all Churches took themselves to be obliged to preserve the same Faith, to exercise Charity and Peace, to maintain the like Holiness of conversation; What then? Do we deny this.

*Ans. 3.* All Kingdoms and States do punish Offenders against Reason and Justice, do banish seditious and disorderly persons, do uphold the Principles and Practice of common Honest and Morality; Doth it thence follow that all nations must come under one civil Government?

Excommunication of other Churches is only a Declaration against the Deviation from Christian Truth, or Piety, or Charity.

*Communicatio suspensa restituitur demonstranti causas, quibus id acciderat, jam esse deterfas, & proficenti condiciones pacis impleras.* P. Inn. I. Ep. 16. (de Attico Constant. Ep.)

*Arg. IX.* All Churches did maintain intercourse and commerce with each other by formed, communicatory, pacificatory, commendatory, synodical Epistles.

Ep. p. 69.  
Lat. p. 222.

*Littera formata.* Optat. 2. Con. Milv. Can. 20.

*communicatoria.* Aug. Ep. 162, 163.

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τὰς κείνων. Euseb. 7. 30. Cypr. Ep. 55, 67.

γροῦματα συστίνδ. Apost. Can. 12.

ἐπιστολαί. Conc. Chald. Can. 11.

Cinodinal. Soz. 7. 11. Conc. VI. Aeth. 11. (p. 158, 198, 223.) Greg. M. (Ep. —) P. Zach.

Baron. A. 743. Sect. 29.

*Significa planè nobis quis in locum Marciiani Arelath furis substitutus, ut sciamus ad quem fratres nostros dirigere, & cui scribere debeamus.* — Cypr. Ep. 42, 67. ad P. Steph. (p. 161.) Ep. 55. (N. B. p. 113.)

ἔνός σώματος καὶ ὁμοῦ καὶ ἑαδελφείας ἑκκλησίας. ἐν ᾧ οἱ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ὡς ἑαδελφοὶ καὶ ὡμοτίμοι καὶ ὡμοκλήτοι ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμεῖς, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν παρ' ἐκείναις καὶ ἡμεῖς, &c. Aex-andri Epist. Socr. I. 6.

The Catholick Church being one body, there being moreover a Command in the Holy Scriptures, to preserve the bond of Peace and Concord; hence it follows, that what things (happen to, or) are done by any of us, we ought to Write, and signifie to each other.

*Ans. 1.* This doth signifie, that the Churches did by Admonition, Advice, &c. help one another in maintenance of the common Faith; did

did endeavour to preserve Charity, Friendship and Peace; this is all which thence may be concluded.

*Answ. 2.* Secular Princes are wont to send Ambassadors and Envoys with Letters and Instructions for settlement of Correspondence and preserving Peace; they sometimes do recommend their Subjects to other Princes; they expect offices of humanity toward their subjects travelling or trading any where in the World; common Reason doth require such things; But may common Unity of Polity from hence be inferr'd?

*Arg. X.* The effectual Preservation of Unity in the primitive Church is alledged as a strong Argument of its being united in one Government. *Ep. pag. 64.*  
*Lat. pag. 221.*

*Answ. 1.* That Unity of Faith and Charity and Discipline, which we admit, was indeed preserved, not by influence of any one Sovereign Authority (whereof there is no mention,) but by the concurrent vigilance of Bishops, declaring and disputing against any Novelty in Doctrine or Practice which did start up; by their adherence to the Doctrine asserted in Scripture and confirmed by Tradition; by their aiding and abetting one another as Confederates against Errours and Disorders creeping in.

*Answ. 2.* The many Differences which arose concerning the Observation of *Easter*, the Re-baptization of Hereticks, the Reconciliation of Revolters and scandalous Criminals; concerning the decision of Causes and Controversies, &c. do more clearly shew that there was no standing common Jurisdiction in the Church; for had there been such an one, recourse would have been had thereto; and such Differences by its Authority would easily have been quashed.

*Arg. XI.* Another Argument is grounded on the Relief which one Church did yield to another, which supposeth all Churches under one Government, imposing such Tribute. *Ep. pag. 119.*  
*Lat. pag. 209.*

*Answ. 1.* This is a strange Fetch: as if all who were under obligation to relieve one another in need, were to be under one Government. Then all Mankind must be so.

*Answ. 2.* It appeareth by *St Paul* that these Succours were of free Charity, Favour and Liberality; and not by Constraint. *2 Cor. 8. 3.*  
*anōdōpēi.*  
*Vers. 8. 2. 12.*

*ἐπιταγή* *2 Cor. 9. 7. ἡ ἀρετὴ τοῦ δαδῶς ἐστὶν ἀρετή.* *Rom. 15. 26. εὐδοκίαν.* *Act. 11. 29. 24. 17. ἐλπί.*  
*μαρτύρας πειρασμῶν.*

*Arg. XII.* The use of Councils is also alledged as an Argument of this Unity. *Ep. pag. 51.*  
*Lat. pag. 400.*

*Answ. 1.* General Councils (in case Truth is disowned, that Peace is disturbed, that Discipline is loosed or perverted,) are *wholsome* Expedients to clear Truth and heal Breaches; but the holding them is no more an Argument of political Unity in the Church, than the Treaty of *Munster* was a sign of all *Europe* being under one civil Government. *Aug.*

*Answ. 2.* They are extraordinary, arbitrary, prudential means of restoring Truth, Peace, Order, Discipline; but from them nothing can be gathered concerning the continual ordinary State of the Church.

*Answ. 3.* For during a long time the Church wanted them; and afterwards had them but rarely; *For the first three hundred years* (saith *Beck*) *there was no general assembly; afterwards scarce one in a hundred years.* *Primis trecentis annis nulla fuit congregatio generalis; postea vix vix centesimo annis. De Rem. P. 1. 8.*



And since the breach between the *Oriental* and *Western* Churches, for many Centenaries, there hath been none.

Yet was the Church from the beginning One, till *Constantine*, and long afterwards.

*Ans. 4.* The first General Councils (indeed all that have been with any probable shew capable of that denomination) were congregated by Emperours, to cure the Dissentions of Bishops; what therefore can be argued from them, but that the Emperours did find it good to settle Peace and Truth; and took this for a good mean thereto?

*Bell. de Conc.*  
1. 13.

*Alb. Pigbins* said that General Councils were an invention of *Constantine*; and who can confute him?

*Ans. 5.* They do shew rather the Unity of the Empire than of the Church; or of the Church as National under one Empire, than as Catholick; for it was the State which did call and moderate them to its purposes.

*Ans. 6.* It is manifest that the congregation of them dependeth on the permission and pleasure of secular Powers; and in all equity should do so, (as elsewhere is shewed.)

The validity of Synodical Decrees (as Spiritual) doth proceed from the Obligation to each singular Bishop; as if Princes in confederacy do make any Sanction, the Subject of each are bound to observe them, not from any relation to the body confederating, but because of their Obligation to their own Prince consenting.

*Ans. 7.* It is not expedient that there should be any of them now that Christendom standeth divided under divers temporal Sovereignities; for their Resolutions may intrench on the Interests of some Princes; and hardly can they be accommodated to the Civil Laws and Customs of every State.

Whence we see that *France* will not admit the Decrees of their *Tridentine* Synod.

*Ans. 8.* There was no such inconvenience in them while Christendom was in a manner confined within one Empire; for then nothing could be decreed or executed without the Emperour's leave or to his prejudice.

*Hist. Trid.*  
p. 67.

A free Coun.  
P. Leo 1. Ep.

*Ans. 9.* Yea (as things now stand) it is impossible there should be a free Council; most of the Bishops being sworn Vassals and Clients to the Pope; and by their own Interests concerned to maintain his exorbitant Grandeur and Domination.

Αἱ δὲ πῶς συνέλθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ (Synodus  
melius ἔχουσιν εὐλογεῖν αὐτῶν; &c. Athan.  
de Syn. p. 873.

*Ans. 10.* In the opinion of St. *Athanasius* there was no reasonable cause of Synods, except in case of new Heresies springing up, which may be confuted by the joint consent of Bishops.

Subrependi e-  
nim occasiones

non pretermittit ambitio, & quoties ob incurrentes causas generalis congregatio facta fuerit Sacerdotum, difficile est ut cupiditas improborum non aliquid supra mensuram suam non molietur appetere. Leo M. Ep. 62. (ad Maximum Ant. Ep. —)

*Ans. 11.* As for particular Synods, they do onely signifie, that it was usefull for neighbour Bishops to conspire in promoting Truth, Order and Peace, as we have elsewhere shewed.

Councils have often been convened for bad Designs, and been made Engines to oppress Truth and enslave Christendom.

That of *Antioch* against *Athanasius*: of *Ariminum* for *Arianism*. The second *Ephesine* to restore *Eutyches*, and reject *Flavianus*. The second of *Nice*, to impose the Worship of Babies. The Synod of *Ariminum*, to countenance *Arians*. So the fourth Synod of *Laterane* (sub Inn. III.) to settle the prodigious Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the wicked Doctrine of Papal Authority over Princes. The first Synod of *Lions*, to practise

practise that hellish Doctrine of Deposing Kings. The Synod of *Constance*, to establish the main of the *Eucharist*; against the *Calistines* of *Bohemia*. The *Laterane* (under *Leo X.*) was called (as the Arch-bishop of *Patras* affirmed) for the *Exaltation of the Apostolical See*. The Synod of *Trent*, to settle a raff of Errours and Superstitions.

*Pro Apostolicæ Sedis exaltatione. Lat. Syn. Sess. 10. p. 129.*

*Obj. II.* It may farther be objected, that this Doctrine doth favour the Conceits of the Independents, concerning Ecclesiastical Discipline.

I answer, No. For,

1. We do assert, that every Church is bound to observe the Institutions of *Christ*, and that sort of Government which the Apostles did ordain, consisting of Bishops, Priests and People.

2. We avow it expedient (in conformity to the primitive Churches, and in order to the maintenance of Truth, Order, Peace,) for several particular Churches or Parishes to be combined in political Corporations; as shall be found convenient by those who have just Authority to frame such Corporations: for that otherwise Christianity, being shattered into numberless shreds, could hardly subsist; and that great Confusions must arise.

3. We affirm, that such Bodies having been established and being maintained by just Authority, every man is bound to endeavour the upholding of them by Obedience, by peaceable and compliant Demeanour.

4. We acknowledge it a great Crime, by factious behaviour in *Jud. 19. Οι αποδιδωτες* them, or by needless separation from them, to disturb them, to divide them, to dissolve or subvert them.

We allow the *Apost. Can. 31.* *ΕΙ τις καταφρονει το ιδιον Επισκοπου χρις (υπαρχοντος) ο διακονου επι εν μη εν κατασκευασ τα Επισκοπου εν ευσεβεια η δικαιοσυνη, κατασκευασεν ος εις αλλο, &c.*

If any person, despising his own Bishop, shall set up a separate meeting, and build another Altar, having nothing to condemn in his Bishop, either for his Piety or uprightness, let him be deposed as one that ambitiously affects to be a Governour, &c.

5. We conceive it fit that every People under one Prince (or at least of one Nation, using the same Language, (Civil Law and Fashions,) should be united in the bands of Ecclesiastical Polity: for that such a Unity apparently is conducive to the peace and welfare both of Church and State; to the furtherance of God's Worship and Service; to the edification of People in Charity and Piety; by the encouragement of secular Powers, by the concurrent advice and aid of Ecclesiastical Pastours; by many advantages hence arising.

*Διχασμω εν ετι παλις του εν τη Ρωμαιοις κρημα διδασκαλικ τα ισμα αυτου απε τα νομι θεσπειν η μη διαφορας δια μακαλιαις η πιστη μαρτυρειν. Syn. Romi: apud Theod. 2. 21.*

6. We suppose all Churches obliged to observe friendly communion; and, when occasion doth invite, to aid each other by assistance and advice, in Synods of Bishops, or otherwise,

7. We do affirm, that all Churches are obliged to comply with lawful Decrees and Orders, appointed in Synods with consent of their Bishops, and allowed by the Civil Authorities, under which they live: As if the Bishops of *Spain* and *France* assembling should agree upon Constitutions of Discipline which the Kings of both those Countries should approve; and which should not thwart God's Laws; both those Churches, and every man in them, were bound to comply in observance of them.

From

From the Premises divers Corollaries may be deduced.

1. Hence it appeareth, that all those clamours of the pretended Catholicks against other Churches, for not submitting to the *Roman* Chair, are groundless; they depending on the supposition, that all Churches must necessarily be united under one Government.

2. The Injustice of the Adherents to that See; in claiming an Empire (or Jurisdiction) over all, which never was designed by our Lord; heavily censuring and fiercely persecuting those who will not acknowledge it.

3. All Churches, which have a fair settlement in several Counties, are co-ordinate; neither can one challenge a Jurisdiction over the other.

4. The Nature of Schism is hence declared; viz. that it consisteth in disturbing the Order and Peace of any single Church; in withdrawing from it Obedience and Compliance with it; in obstructing good Correspondence, Charity, Peace, between several Churches; in condemning or censuring other Churches without just cause, or beyond due measure.

In refusing to maintain Communion with other Churches, without reasonable cause; whence *Firmilian* did challenge *P. Stephanus* with Schism.

*Excidisti enim teipsum; noli te fallere; si quidem ille est vero Schismaticus, qui se à communione Ecclesiastica Unitatis Apostatum fecerit.* Firmil. apud Cypr. Ep. 75.

5. Hence the right way of reconciling Dissentions among Christians is not affecting to set up a political Union of several Churches, or subordination of all to one Power; not for one Church to enterprize upon the Liberty of others, or to bring others under it, (as is the practice of the *Roman* Church and its Abettors,) but for each Church to let the others alone, quietly enjoying its freedom in Ecclesiastical Administrations; onely declaring against apparently hurtfull Errours and Factions; shewing Good-will, yielding Succour, Advice, Comfort, upon needfull occasion; according to that excellent Advice of the *Constantinopolitane* Fathers to the Pope and *Western* Bishops—(after having acquainted them with their proceedings) towards the conclusion they thus exhort them.

Οἱς ἐὺδοκίμως καὶ κατανικῶς πρὸς ἡμῶν  
κακερτακῶς καὶ πῶς ὑπετέρον συγχαίρων  
παραλαβὴν εὐλαβίαν, τῆς πιδματι-  
κῆς μαρτυρίας ἀγάπης, καὶ τῆς κλειανῆς  
φύσεως πῶς ἡ ὑπετάσσουσα (com-  
pressing) ἀδελφότητι προσάδειαν, καὶ  
ἡ Ἐκκλησίαν οἰκονομῶν πνευματικῶν  
παιδῶν καὶ πῶς ἡ ὑπετάσσουσα εἶνα συμπα-  
θείας ἡ χάρις. ὅταν γὰρ πῶς ἡ πῆ-  
σεως συμπερινοῦνται λόγῳ, καὶ τῆς χει-  
ριστικῆς κυριαρχίας ἐν ἡμῶν ἀγάπης πνε-  
υματικῶν ἀγαθῶν τὸ ἔργον. Ἀποστόλων  
κατεργασμένων, Ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμι Παῦλος,  
ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπόλλων, ἐγὼ δὲ Κεφα. πάντες δὲ  
Κεφαλαίοντες, ὅς ἐν ἡμῶν ἡ μεμείκται  
ἀγάπῃ τὸ σῶμα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πνευματικῆς,  
καὶ τὸ βῆμα τῆς Κλειανῆς καὶ τῆς πῶς ἡ  
ἐκκλησίας. Theod. 5. 9.

We, having in a legal and canonical way determi-  
ned these Controversies, do beseech your Reverence  
to congratulate with us, your Charity spiritually in-  
terceding, the fear of the Lord also compressing all  
humane affection, so as to make us to prefer the edi-  
fication of the Churches to all private respect and fa-  
vour toward each other; for by this means the word  
of faith being consonant among us, and Christian Cha-  
rity bearing sway over us, we shall cease from spea-  
king after that manner which the Apostle condemns,  
I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos, but I am of  
Cephas; for if we all do appear to be of Christ, who  
is not divided amongst us, we shall then through God's  
grace preserve the body of the Church from Schism,

and present our selves before the throne of Christ with boldness.

6. All that withdraw their communion to obeysance from par-  
ticular Churches fairly established, (unto which they do belong or  
where



where they reside, do incur the guilt of Schism: for such persons being *de Jure* subject to those particular Churches, and excommunicating themselves, do consequentially sever themselves from the Catholick Church; they commit great wrong toward that particular Church, and toward the whole Church of *Christ*.

7 Neither doth their pretence of joining themselves to the *Roman* Church excuse them from Schism: for the *Roman* Church hath no reason or right to admit or to avow them; it hath no power to exempt or excuse them from their duty; it thereby abetteth their Crime, and involveth it self therein; it wrongeth other Churches. As no man is freed from his Allegiance by pretending to put himself under the protection of another Prince; neither can another Prince justly receive such disloyal Revolters into his Patronage.

It is a Rule grounded upon apparent Equity, and frequently declared by Ecclesiastical Canons, that no Church shall admit into its protection or communion any persons who are excommunicated by another Church, or who do withdraw themselves from it: (for self-excommunication or Spiritual felony *de se* doth involve the Churches in Excommunication, deserving it, and preventing it.)

Aug. contra Jul. Ep. 2. Te certe occidentalis terra generavit, occidentalis regnavit Ecclesia: quid ei quæris inferre quod in ea non invenisti? quando in ejus membra venisti? imò quid, &c.

Synd. Sard.  
Can. 13. Gr.

Tornd. Lat.  
P. 220.

Αὐτοκατακκο-  
τῶ. Tit. 3.  
11.  
Εἰ τις κληρο-

κός ἢ λαϊκός ἀφορισμένος, ἢ πᾶσι δὲ ἀποδοῦναι, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ πόλει δεχέσθαι ἀπὸ γερμανῶν (Cyprianus), ἀφορι-  
ζέσθαι καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ. Apost. Can. 12.

Καὶ λέγειτο γινώσκοντες τὸ καὶ τὸ διαφύγοντα καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μηδὲν ἐκκλησιῶν.

Conc. Nic. Can. 5.

If any Clerk, or Laick, who hath been excommunicated, and not yet readmitted (by his own Church) shall depart thence, and be received in another City without Letters commendatory, both he who doth receive him, and he that is received, let them be excommunicated.

Let the sentence be ratified which is according to that Canon which commands others not to admit those whom others have ejected.

Which Canon as the *African* Fathers do alledge and expound it, doth prohibit the *Pope himself* from receiving persons rejected by any other Church.

Εἰς κοινότητα τῶν λοιπῶν θέλῃτε δεχέσθαι, ἐπὶ τῶν τούτων καὶ τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ (Cyprianus) δεχέσθαι δεχέσθαι ἑαυτοὺς ἢ οὐκ ἐν βασιλείᾳ. Syn. Afr. Epist. ad P. Celest. 1.

Εἰ τις ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποκρίνεται ἄλλῳ, καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸν παρ' ἐτέρων δεχέσθαι, εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸς πάλιν δεχέσθαι τὸ ἴδιον ἑπισκόπον. — Conc. Ant. Can. 6. Idem in Concil. Sard. Can. 13, 14. (Græc.)

So when *Marcion*, having been excommunicated by his own Father, coming to *Rome*, did sue to be received by that Church into communion, they refused, telling him that, *they could not do it without the consent of his Reverend Father, between whom and them there being one faith and one agreement of mind, they could not do it in opposition to their worthy fellow labourer, who was also his Father.*

Πῶς τῷ τιμίῳ πατρὶ σου τούτῳ ποιήσαι μὴ καὶ ὅτι καὶ ἡ πίστις καὶ ἡ οὐνοῦ, καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἀντιπαρῶν τῶν ἁγίων συλλειτουργῶν, πατεῖ ὁ σὺ. Epiph. Her. 42.

St. Cyprian refused to admit *Maximus* (sent from the *Novatian* party) to communion.

So did P. *Cornelius* reject *Feliciſſimus*, condemned by St. Cyprian, without farther inquiry.

Ep. 55. init. (abs te rejectum. Vid.)  
Vid. Rig. p. 79.

It was charged upon *Dioscorus* as a heinous misdemeanour, that he had against the Holy Canons, by his proper authority, received into communion persons excommunicated by others.

— quosdam a  
diversis Con-  
ciliis ritè

damnatos, in communionem, propriâ auctoritate, suscepit, Sanctis Regulis præcipientibus excommunicatos ab aliis, in communionem alios non debere suscipere. Epist. Syn. Chalced. ad Imper. Ath. 4. pag. 286.

καὶ δεχόμενος καὶ ἑτέροις ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποκρίνεται αὐτὸν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. Evagr. 2. 4.

The

The African Synod (at the suggestion of St. Austin) decreed, that if it happen'd that any for their evil deeds were deservedly expell'd out of the Church, and taken again into communion by any Bishop or Priest whosoever, that he also who received him, should incur the same penalty of Excommunication.

*Augustinus Episcopus, legatus Provin-  
cie Numidie dixit; Hoc statuere dignamini, ut si qui forte meritis facinorum suorum ab Ecclesia pulsi sunt, & sive ab aliquo Episcopo vel Presbytero fuerint in communionem suscepti, etiam ipsi pari cum eis crimine teneatur obnoxiius — Cod. Afr. Can. 9.*

The same is by latter Papal Synods decreed.

*Sanctorum quippe canonum sanxit auctoritas, & ea passim Ecclesie consuetudo servat, ut à quolibet iuste excommunicatum Episcopo, alius absolvere non presumat. P. Urb. II. Epist. 20. (apud Bin.)*

*A suis Episcopis excommunicatos, ab alijs Episcopis, Abbatibus & Clericis in communionem recipi procul dubio prohibemus. Conc. Lat. I. (sub P. Calixto II.) cap. 9.*

*Qui vero excommunicato antequam ab eo qui eum excommunicaverit absolvetur, scienter communicare presumpserit, pari sententia teneatur obnoxiius. Conc. Lat. (sub Innoc. II.) Can. 3.*

The Words of Synesius are remarkable: He, having excommunicated some cruel Oppressours, doth thus recommend the case to all Christians.

*Ἐν τούτοις ἡ Πτολεμαῖος ἡ Ἑλλάς — Εἰ δὲ περὶ τῶν μικροπολίτων ἀποκυβερῶν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ δὲ τῶν καὶ κατακυβερῶν αὐτῶν (proscribed by it) ὡς ἐκ ἀδύγκῃ τῇ πυνῇ ἀνιδιαν, ἐπεὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ Ἑλληνιστῶν, ἢ μὴν ὁ θεὸς ἐδὲ βούλεται. — Epist. 58 pag. 203. Edit. Petav.*

P. Leo Ep. 84. cap. 9. Upon which grounds I do not scruple to affirm the Recufants in England to be no less Schismaticks than any other Separatists. They are indeed somewhat worse; for most others do onely forbear communion, these do rudely condemn the Church, to which they owe Obedience, yea, strive to destroy it: they are most desperate Rebels against it.

8. It is the Duty and Interest of all Churches to disclaim the Pretences of the Roman Court; maintaining their Liberties and Rights against its Usurpations: For Compliance therewith, as it doth greatly prejudice Truth and Piety; leaving them to be corrupted by the ambitious, covetous and voluptuous Designs of those men; so it doth remove the genuine Unity of the Church and Peace of Christians; unless to be tyed by compulsoy Chains (as Slaves) be deemed Unity or Peace.

9. Yet those Churches, which by the voluntary consent or command of Princes, do adhere in confederation to the Roman Church, we are not, merely upon that score, to condemn or reject Communion of Charity or Peace; (for in that they do but use their Liberty.)

10. But if such Churches do maintain impious Errours; if they do prescribe naughty Practices; if they do reject Communion and Peace upon reasonable terms; if they vent unjust and uncharitable Censures; if they are turbulent and violent, striving by all means to subdue and enslave other Churches to their will or their dictates — if they they damn and persecute all who refuse to be their Subjects: in such Cases we may reject such Churches as heretical or schismatical, or wickedly uncharitable and unjust in their Proceedings.

*Cuiusque heresi communicans merito  
iudicatur à nostra societate removendus.  
Gelas. Ep. 1. ad Euphem.*

*An communicare, non est consentire cum  
talibus? P. Sym. I. Ep. 7.*

A TABLE of the AUTHORS quoted  
in the Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, and  
Unity of the Church.

*A.*  
**S. Ambrosius.**  
in *Luc.*  
de *Pœn.*  
de *Sac.*

*Anastafius* in *vit. Joh.*

*Anton.* de *Confil. Pis.*

*Anselmus* in *Joh.*

*Apost. Can.*

*Aquinas (Tho.)*

*Arist. Pol.*

*S. Athanas.* *Disp. contra Arium, 3.*

*Athanas.*

*Athanas.* de *Syn.*

*August.* *Triumph.*

*S. Augustinus* contra *Crescon.*

Idem de *Unit. Eccles.*

*Ep.*

in *S. Joh.*

contra *Dori.*

de *Bapt.*

in *Psal.*

contra. *Jul.*

*B.*

*Balustius.*

*Not.* ad *Agorbad.*

*Baronius.*

*S. Basil.*

*Epist.*

in *If.*

de *Judicio Dei.*

*Bellarminus.*

*S. Bernardus.*

de *confid.*

*Binius.*

*Bochel.*

*Bodin.* de *Rep.*

*Bulle* *Variorum P. &c.*

*C.*

*Camd. Hist.*

*Canon. Apost.*

*Cajet.* in *1 Cor.*

*Canus.*

*Celest.* ad *Cyrl.*

*Chrysol.*

*S. Crystostomus.*

Idem in *Ephes.*

in *Act. Apost.*

in *S. Joh.*

in *Galat. ibid.*

*Ep. 135.*

in *Colos.*

in *1 Cor.*

*Claudianus.*

*Clemens* ad *Corinth.*

*S. Clemens Alex.*

*Clemens Alex.* apud *Euseb.*

*Cod. Afr.*

*Cod. Lib. 1.*

*Consilium Ant.*

*Bas.*

*Chalced.*

*Sard.*

*Trid.*

*Lat.*

*Ludg.*

*Tolet.*

*Nic.*

*Trull.*

*Eph.*

*Florent.*

*Conf.*

*Miler.*

*Carth. ibid.*

*Conc. sub Men.*

*Const. Apost.*

*Card. Cusanus* de *Conc. Carth.*

*S. Cyprianus.*

de *Unit. Eccles.*

in *Conc. Carth.*

*Ep.*

*S. Cyril.*

*D.*

*Damasc P. Ep.*

*Distinct. &c.*

*Durandus.*

*Dionysius* de *Eccl. Hier.*

*E.*

*Eadmeri Hist.*

*S. Epiphan.*

*Hæc.*

*Erasmi Præfat.* ad *Hieron.*

*Evag.*

*Euseb.*

*Hist.*

de *Vit Const.*

*Q*

*P. Fas.*



# A Table of the Authours, &c.

*F.*  
*Fac. Hermian.*  
*Florus.*

*G.*  
*Pope Gelas. distinc.*  
*Ep.*  
*Georg. Alex. vita Chrs.*  
*Gervas Dorob. apud Twisd.*  
*Grat. Dist.*  
*Greg. Decret.*  
*Greg. Past.*  
*Greg. M. Ep.*  
*S. Greg. Naz.*  
*Guicc.*  
*Cumb. Lig.*

*H.*  
*Hegesippus apud Euseb.*  
*Hesychius apud Photium*  
*Hieron. adv. Evagar.*  
*Hieron. Ep.*  
*S. Hier. in Matt.*  
*in Jovin.*  
*Hilar. de Trin.*  
*Hilar.*  
*Hist. Trident.*  
*Horat.*

*I.*  
*Ignat. ad Trall.*  
*S. Iren.*  
*Joseph. de Bello Jud.*  
*Isid. Dist.*  
*Isid. Hispal.*  
*Isid. Pelusiot.*  
*Justini Cod.*  
*Justini Novell.*

*L.*  
*Lactantius.*  
*Lateran. Concil.*  
*Launoius.*  
*P. Leo Ep.*  
*Livinus.*

*M.*  
*Machiavel.*  
*De Marc.*  
*Marfil. Patav.*  
*Matt. Paris.*  
*Memor. Hist. de 5 Propos.*

*N.*  
*Pope Nic. Ep.*  
*O.*  
*Occam.*  
*Optat. lib. 2.*  
*Orient. Relat ad imper. A&.*  
*Orig. in Matt.*

*Otho. Frising Chron.*  
*P.*  
*Pope Passh. Ep. apud Eadmer.*  
*Pelag. Ep.*  
*Petr. ad Jacob.*  
*Photius.*  
*Pighius de Hier.*  
*Platina de Vit. Pont.*  
*Plut. in Pyrr.*  
*Prudent. in Apotheof.*  
*R.*  
*Rigalt. in Cypr. Ep.*  
*Ruffinus.*

*S.*  
*Senec. de Benef.*  
*Sigeberti Chron.*  
*Sleid.*  
*Socrates, Sozom.*  
*Spalatenf.*  
*Suetonius.*  
*P. Symac.*  
*Synes. Ep.*  
*Synod. Ant.*  
*Ansel.*  
*Baf.*  
*Chalc.*  
*Const.*  
*Eph.*  
*Trull.*  
*Nic.*  
*Flor.*  
*Laod.*  
*Sard.*

*T.*  
*Tacitus.*  
*Ann.*  
*de Morib. Germ,*  
*Tertullianus.*  
*Theod.*  
*Theoph. in Matth.*  
*Iho. Aq.*  
*Thorn.*  
*Thuan.*  
*Tort. Tort.*  
*Trid Concil.*  
*Twisd.*

*V.*  
*Valesi. in Euseb.*  
*P. Urb. Ep. 7.*  
*Usserius.*

*Z.*  
*Zabarellus.*  
*Zozomen.*

# A T A B L E O F

Things, or the Chief Matters contained in  
the Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, and of  
the Unity of the Church.

**A**bsolution. Particular Absolution, why allowed in the Church of Rome, 136.

Anacletus and Cletus, by some thought to be the same, 83.

Anathema's of the Romanists, 269.

Angels. Popish Doctrine of worshipping them, contrary to Scripture, 264.

Apostles. Which the Elder, 31. That Office of the greatest Authority in the Primitive Church, 34. This Authority of their Office they frequently assert; never Superiority over one another, 47. Their Manner of Life, *ibid.* Their Equality attested by the Fathers, and plain from Scripture, 53, 54. Their extraordinary Privileges and miraculous Powers not successive, nor communicable, 74.

Appeals to the Pope disclaimed, 230, 231.

## B

St. Basil. His Authority against the Pope's Supremacy, 115.

Bishops. How to discharge their Office, 36. In what sense said to be Successors of the Apostles, 75. All Bishops styled *Clavigeri* by the Council of Compeigne, 61. Their Residence and Translation, 80, 81. The Highest Order in the Church, 125. Their Equality, notwithstanding some Differences in Order, and Privileges, 122, 126, 148. An Answer to such who object, They had a Power, as well as Emperours, to call General Councils, 188. Metropolitan Bishops in their Provinces had far more Power, and more truly grounded, than the Pope had in the whole Church, 196. What kind of Authority they had heretofore in Synods, *ibid.* Their Ordination, in

whose Power; Their Authority and Rights, 199, 200. Constitution of them, not in the Power of the Pope, but Emperour, 209. Nor Censuring them, in the power of the Pope, 214, 215. No power in the Pope to depose them, 216. --- The contrary Assertions examined and confuted, *in seq. v.* 223. Confirmation of them belongs not to the Pope, 250.

Bishops and Pastors. Their Authority in Church-Government in the Primitive Church, 291, 292. Their Character, *ibid.*

## C

Canon Law. The vain pretence for the Obligation thereof, 194.

Canons. Ancient Canons, their silence concerning the Pope's Authority, 117, 118.

Canons. Universal Canons, Popes no Power to alter them, nor exemption from them, 197. Their Policy herein, *ibid.* Contrary Opinion, from whence arising, *ibid.*

Canons of Pope's, why set above General Councils, 250. *Aeneas Silvius*, his Account hereof, *ibid.*

Catholic. How much the abuse of that Word hath conduced to the Pope's Pretences, 245.

Censures. Ecclesiastical Censures, the great advantages made from them by the Pope, 178.

Ceremonies. Why multitude of them in the Church of Rome, 136.

Charity. Want thereof in the Church of Rome, 266.

Charity among Christians, 279, 281. Breach thereof denominates a man to be no Christian, 280.

Charity to the Poor of other Churches in Primitive times, no Argument of Unity of Church-Government, 299.

## A Table of Things, or Chief Matters

- Church.* Unity thereof, 273. The various acceptations of the Word *Church*, 274. The Titles and Privileges thereof, 275.
- Church Government and Discipline* in ancient time, 159, &c.
- Church Government.* No necessity of one kind onely of external Administration thereof, 286, 287. The contrary shewed to be most proper and convenient, *in seq.*
- Church of Rome.* An Account of them who by voluntary Consent or Command of Princes do adhere in Confederation to the Church of *Rome*, 304.
- Civil Magistrates Authority*, 252.
- Clergy.* Romish Clergy's Exemption from secular Jurisdiction, whence 135.
- Communion.* Church Communion, 276.
- Community* of Men on several accounts may be termed One, 277.
- Confession.* Auricular Confession, 139.
- Confirmation of Magistrates* belongs not to the Pope, 250.
- Conscience.* The Usurpations made thereupon by the Popish Doctrines, 268.
- Constantine M.* His Judgment of *Eusebius*, 82. No General Synod before his Reign, 181.
- Controversies in the Church*, how in ancient times determined, 113, 145, 245, 283, 284.
- Council of Trent.* Their Character, 2. Enjoynd the Pope's Supremacy should not be disputed, 17.
- Councils.* Their Authority above the Pope's, 22.
- Councils.* Their Infallibility, why pretended, 136.
- Councils.* General Councils, which so esteemed, 184: first called by the Emperours, *ibid.* when first celebrated, 193. Use of them proves not there was Unity of Government in the Primitive Church, 299: the proper occasion of General Councils assigned, *ibid.*
- Cup in the Sacrament*, why with-holden from the Laity, 136.
- St. Cyprian's Account* of St. Peter's Primacy of Order, 30: his Epistle concerning the deposing *Marcianus* examined, 218, &c.
- St. Cyril's* supplying the Place of P. C. *lispine* in the General Council, 197, 198.
- Cyril of Hierusalem*, the first, according to *Sacratei*, who did introduce *Ap-peals*, 231.
- D**
- Pope Damasus.* An Epistle of his in *Theodoret* ( whence *Bellarmino's* pre-tence for the Pope's Supremacy) ad-judged spurious 153, 154.
- Decrees of Popes*, when contested against the ancient Canons, 198. Whence their new Decrees introduced, *ibid.*
- Decretal Epistles.* Their Forgery, and great advantage to the Church of *Rome*, 180.
- Discipline*, and Order of the Primitive Church, 195.
- Discipline.* The enacting, and dispen-sing with Ecclesiastical Laws about the same belong'd of old to Empe-rours, 198.
- Discipline* of the Church, 285. main Form thereof not to be violated, *ibid.*
- Dispensations*, 180. The Pope no pow-er to grant them, 251, 261.
- Dissensions.* The Mischiefs arising from them, 172, 177. The Profits accruing from hence to the Romanists, *ibid.*
- Dissensions.* How reconciled among Christians, 302.
- E**
- Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, not impugn'd by disclaiming St. Peter's Superiority, 36.
- Emperours*, not Popes, did first con-gregate General Synods, 181. Te-stimonies of Popes owning the same, 188.
- Emperours* themselves, or Honourable Persons authorized by them, did heretofore preside in General Synods, 197.
- Empires.* Their Original and Increase, 171.
- Episcopacy.* The Ends assigned of that Order, 82.
- Eusebius.* *Constantine M.* his Chara-cter of him, 81.
- Excommunicated Persons*, not admitted into Communion by other Churches, 285, 303, 304, 324, 325.
- Exemptions.* The Pope no Power to grant them, 251.
- F**
- Faith.* Unity of the Church preserved by it, 279.
- Fathers.* What regard to be given to their account of St. Peter's Primacy, of Order, or bare Dignity, 29.
- Fathers.* A Censure of their Writings, 67. *Bellarmino's* account of the same, *ibid.* The latter Fathers most guilty Expressions, 68.
- Fathers.* A Character of their Wri-tings, 116.



## in the Treatise of the *Pope's Supremacy, &c.*

*Feed my sheep.* The Romish Interpretation rejected, and the true established, *ibid.*

G

*Glosses* of the Romanists on Scripture, 65: their Corruptions and Partiality herein, 69.

*Gregory M.* his Character and Authority against the Pope, 120.

H

*Heretic of Simony.* Popes guilty of it, 248.

*Hereticks.* How confuted in ancient times, 113, &c.

*Humility* strictly enjoined to Christ's Apostles and Followers, 35.

I

*Jesuites.* Their Character, 178.

*Jesus,* according to common notion of the Jews, did imply his being the Son of God, 27.

*Ignorance* of Popes in Divinity, 249.

*Ignorance.* How Serviceable to the Church of Rome, 178.

*Image Worship,* 136, 261.

*Indulgences,* 180.

*Infallibility.* Pretence to it the greatest Tyranny, 134. Whence pretended, 136. The Mother of Incurability, and Corruption of Manners, 137. v. 247.

*Inspiration.* The Popes and Synods bold pretensions to it, 266.

*Jurisdiction.* Universal Jurisdiction over the Clergy, the Pope's presumption herein, and when begun, 199.

*Jurisdiction.* Temporal and Ecclesiastical nature thereof, 254.

K

*Keys.* Power thereof, as also all other Authority, communicated to all the Apostles equally, 39, 60.

*Kings* have the power only of calling General Councils, 186. The unreasonableness of the contrary, 187. v. *Emperours.*

L

*Legends* of the Church of Rome, the Profits arising from them, 180.

*Laws.* Ecclesiastical Laws. In whose Power to enact them, 196. The Pope subject to them, *ibid.*

M

*Marriage.* The Romanists abuse thereof, 264. Why forbidden to their Priests, 188.

*Mass.* Doctrine thereof, *ibid.*

*Merit.* Doctrine thereof in the Church of Rome, 135, 286.

*Miracles.* Why pretended to by the Romanists, 136.

*Monarchy.* Universal Monarchy not po-

litick, nor convenient, 127: neither in Church, nor State, 149.

*Monarchy,* less subject to Abuse than other ways of Government, 294.

*Monasteries.* Why exempted by the Pope from secular Jurisdiction, 135.

*Monkery,* 137.

N

*Pope Nicolas,* the first who excommunicated Princes, *secundum Bodin.* 143.

O

*Out* of Bishops of Rome, at their Election, 21.

*Obedience.* Blind Obedience, 174.

*Order and Discipline* of the Primitive Church, 195. v. *Discipline.*

*Ordination.* Priority therein did antiently ground a Right to Precedence, 31.

*Orthodox.* Who such in the Primitive Church, 279.

P

*Pastors* of the Church. Their Duty to maintain Peace and Charity, 284.

*Patriarchs,* not an higher Order than Primates, 166: their Institution and Authority, 167, 168.

*Peace* to be inviolable among Christians, 281: the Sacraments conducive to the same, 282: as also Convocation of Synods, *ibid.*

*St. Peter* in personal accomplishments most eminent among the Apostles, 25: It is probable he was first called to the Apostolical Office, 30: his Zeal and Activity, 27, 31 his Superiority in Power rejected, 32: was no Priest at the Celebration of our Lord's Supper, *contra Concil. Trid.* 33: not Bishop of Rome, 78: whether ever at Rome, 79: whence his Primacy asserted, 25.

*Pope's Supremacy.* The Controversies about it, 1: The great Disturbances it hath caused, 2: Pretended Authority to depose Princes, 3: Their behaviour according to their circumstances, 16: pretended Supremacy in Spirituals, 18: their impetuous, arbitrary Government, 37: the insolent Titles given them, 38: no Judge of Controversies, 113, &c. their Character before and after *Constantine*, 139: Usurpation on Princes, 142: Causes of the growth of pretended Supremacy, 169, 170: did not claim a Power of summoning General Councils till they had in a manner shaken off subjection to the Emperour, 187: no more authority in Councils, than Patriarchs and other Clergy, 188: Supremacy, not indefectable and unalterable, 252: a Cha-

## A Table of Things, or Chief Matters, &c.

- a Character of them, and their Ufurpations, 194, 293, 294: Supremacy disclaimed, 288.
- Power.** Worldly Power, 171: Description thereof, and how much it hath advanced the Pope's Ufurpations, *ib.*
- Pragmatical Sanctions**, 180.
- Presidency of the Pope**, no-wise necessary to the being of a General Council, 193.
- Presidency.** Some imposed upon by the ambiguity of that word, 198.
- Presidencies.** Spiritual Presidencies: To erect and translate them a Prerogative of Sovereign Power, 251.
- Presidents** in Council appointed by Popes, of no Authority, 197.
- Priests**, why forbidden Marriage by the Church of Rome, 136.
- Primacy.** Three kinds thereof, 27.
- Primacy in St. Peter** neither personal nor successive, 72.
- Primacy of St. John and St. James** have more spacious Titles, than of St. Peter, 66, 70.
- Primacies.** Diocesan Primacies: the Pope's great gain in the W. Churches not embracing that Discipline, 167.
- Privileges.** The Pope no Power to grant them, 251.
- Provincial Synods.** When Appeals were first made from them, 230.
- Purgatory.** Whence invented, 135.
- R
- Reliques** among the Ro. 136.
- Remission of Sins.** The Popish Doctrines and Errours about it. 260, 261.
- Resignation of Bishops**, not an Act of Jurisdiction, never in the power of the Pope, 224, &c. pretended Examples shewed to be invalid, *in seq.*
- Residence of Bishops**, 80: their Translation, 81.
- Revelation.** Divine Revelation made by the Apostles, the only ground of absolute Belief, 124.
- Rock.** St. Peter being so called, examined, 55.
- Romanists.** An Enumeration of some of their Errours, 135, &c.
- Romanists**, in England, Schismatics, 304. A farther Character of them, *ibid.*
- Romish Church** vainly pretends to greatest Antiquity, 289.
- S
- Sacraments.** The *Opus Operatum* therein among the Romanists, 135: why celebrated by them in an unknown tongue, 136: their farther abuse thereof, 267, 268.
- Saints.** Papists Doctrine of worshiping them contrary to Scripture, 261.
- Schism.** Nature thereof, 302: the persons guilty of it, *ibid.*
- Scripture.** the only Rule for our Belief, 32.
- Scriptures.** Prohibiting of them, whence, 136, 263: and Teaching them in an unknown tongue, *ibid.*
- Separations in the Church.** The Mischiefs of them 301.
- Simony.** Popes guilty of it, 248.
- Sovereignty.** The particular Branches thereof considered, and Popes vain Pretences to the same, 181.
- Spirit. v. Inspiration.**
- Synod.** No General Synod before Constantine M. 181.
- Synods.** In ancient Synods divers Things were ordained without the Pope's consent, divers against his pleasure, 196, 194. Instances hereof, *in seq.*
- Synods.** No Rule extant about 'em in the first Fathers, till after 280 years, 195.
- Synods.** Their Decrees and Acts, by whom ratified, 196, 197, 198.
- Synods** Romish Synods and Enthusiasts compared, 266.
- T
- Taxes.** Imposing them on Clergy, or People, not in the power of the Pope, 251.
- Tradition**, in some matters very uncertain and contradictory, 31.
- Traditions** of the Church of Rome, 136.
- Traditions.** Oral Traditions, 269.
- Tradition.** Universal Tradition disowns the Pope's Supremacy, 249.
- Transubstantiation**, 136.
- Trent** (Council) Character thereof, 241.
- U
- Unity of the Church**, mentioned in the Constantinopolitan Creed, not of external Policy, 295.
- Unity.** Preservation thereof in the Primitive Church no Argument of its being united in one Government, 299.
- Vows**, in the Church of Rome, why imposed, 135.
- W
- Wealth**, how procured by the Church of Rome, 179.
- Words.** False Interpretations of words, how much contributing to the growth of the Church of Rome.

The End of the First Volume. C

